

THE
Doctrine and Practice
OF THE
CHURCH
OF
SCOTLAND,

ANENT THE
Sacrament of Baptism,

VINDICATED
From the Charge of Gross Error

EXHIBITED
In a Print called, *The Practice and Doctrine of the
Presbyterian Preachers, about the Sacrament of
Baptism, Examined.*

*By Mr. Haddo professor of
Theology in
St. Andrew's*

PART I.

Printed in the Year, M. DCC. IV.

THE
DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE

OF THE
CHURCH

OF
SCOTLAND.



EDINBURGH

PRINTED

FROM THE CHARGE OF GLASSBORO

UNIVERSITY

IN THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

PART I.

OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

CHAP. I. Of the Scope of the Pamphlet, with the Author's Charge against the Presbyterians.

THE External Form of Church Government was generally believed to have been the great and chief Point, wherein the Episcopal Clergy in *Scotland* did differ from the Presbyterians; But now they give the World to understand, That the Breach is wider than was apprehended, and that they dissent from Presbyterians in Points of Faith, and Matters that more nearly concern Salvation. They quarrel the received Confession of Faith, as containing not only *many Dubious*, but also *some very Erroneous Propositions*. And it is Matter of just Complaint against the Episcopal Clergy, That they suffer Pamphlets to be published in their Name, wherein the Confession of Faith, the approved and authorised Test of Orthodoxy in this Church, is so disparaged by a general Charge of Error, without either condescending on the Particulars, or giving a Declaration of their Judgment in a plain Confession of their own. The *Arminians* were justly jealous of Unsoundness in the Faith, when they began to quarrel the Confession of the *Belgick Churches*, without exhibiting their Scruples, or condescending on Particulars. And when our Episcopalians give the same Ground of Jealousie, it would seem to be their Concern, plainly to declare themselves in the Doctrines they controvert. For, tho' some of them may, now and then, drop some particular Article, wherein they disprove the received Doctrine of this Church; Yet, while they do not fully declare themselves, while we know not where they may stop, they still leave ground to suspect a *Snake in the Grass*.

The Necessity of Baptism is one particular Point condescended upon in a Pamphlet, Entituled, *The Practice and Doctrine of the Preachers, about the Sacrament of Baptism, Examined*: With respect to which, the Author charges, *Pag. 7. Presbyterians with gross Error upon the plain and intelligible Principles of Christianity*. This Pamphlet, tho' published some few Months ago, hath not as yet (so far as I know) received any direct Answer: Whether it be, that some have thought, the Doctrine of Presbyterians, in this Matter, was sufficiently known to be conformable to that of other Reformed Churches; Or, that the Pamphlet did so expose its own Weakness, that it needed no Confutation, I shall not determine. However, seeing the Author craves an Answer, and may misinterpret a constant Silence, to the prejudice of Truth, I have resolved to take his Pamphlet under Consideration. And my Essay may perhaps excite others to handle this Matter to better purpose.

This Author, in his Introduction, intimates, That his Scope and Design is, to plead for a *Toleration* to the Episcopal Clergy and People; and undertakes to exhibit some weighty Reasons of their Aversion to join in Communion with Presbyterians. The Grounds and Reasons he offers are three. The *First* is from the Practice of Presbyterian Ministers, that they universally refuse to Baptise, unless it be on a *Sunday*, or some other set Preaching Day of the Week, tho' the Children, for whom Baptism is required, be more likely to die than to live one day. The *Second Reason* is from their Doctrine, whereby they defend this Practice, That *Baptism is not necessary to Salvation*. The *Third* is also from their Practice, That, by a most pernicious Error, they add to the Creed in Baptism, by requiring of Parents or Sureties, in the Name of Children to be baptised, a Belief of their Confession of Faith, and Shorter and Larger Catechisms.

These are the Heads of his Charge against the Presbyterians, which shall be severally considered. And in the Method of Procedure, I shall begin,

1. With the Doctrine of the Non-necessity of Baptism to Salvation, which is the Point he spends the most part of his Pamphlet upon, and serves to clear the Practice.

2. I shall enquire into his first Charge, That they universally refuse to Baptise, unless on a *Sunday* or Sermon Day.

3. I shall consider his last Charge, Of their requiring a Belief of their Confession and Catechisms in Baptism.

4. I shall examine, if these Reasons he hath offered, are sufficient to warrant a Separation from the Worship of the Established National Church, and so to make a Legal Toleration necessary in favours of the separat Meetings of these of the Episcopal Perswasion.

Before he enters upon his weighty Reasons against Presbyterians, he intimates, *P. 3.* That he will not meddle with what is objected against the Validity of their Ordinations: I think he did wisely in forbearing, unless he can acquit himself to better purpose, than some others have done, who attempted to touch upon that String. And when ever he shall think fit to undertake this Task, he may be pleased to take a View of *Mr. Meldrum's Vindication* against the *Examinator* of his *Sermon*, which hitherto (so far as I know) hath received no Reply. However, when our Author passeth this Point, he thinks fit to do it with a charitable Admonition: "Only (says he) I presume, as a Friend, to advertise them, that they are highly concerned, seriously to reflect on it, lest the Charge prove true against them, and they be one day found sacrilegiously to have usurped a Vicegerency to Christ, without his Mission and Investiture. I think indeed Presbyterians are herein highly concerned, and they ought to take in good part this friendly Advertisement; Nor, after this, are they to question his Friendship, tho' they should meet with Sarcastick Jybes in every Page of his Pamphlet.

And I hope, that a Friend will not take it in ill part, if a like Advertisement shall be given to his Ghostly Fathers the late Prelats, That it is their Concern, to reflect seriously upon the Divine Warrant for their acclaimed Power and Order in the Church, and for their Civil Places in the State, lest they be found to have usurped an Office in the Church, which Christ hath not instituted, and to have entangled themselves with the Affairs of this Life, without his Allowance.

I shall also presume, as a Friend, to advertise his Brethren of the Episcopal Clergy, who served under the late Prelacy, that they are highly concerned, seriously to reflect on their Mission and Investiture, if they held their Ministry of Jesus Christ as Head, seeing they received their Orders from the late Bishops, who derived all their Power, not from Christ as Supream, but from the King, whose Ecclesiastick Supremacy was acknowledged to be an Inherent Right of the Crown, according to the Fundamental Charter of the late *Erastian* Prelacy, contained in *Act 1. Sess. 2. Par. 1.* and *Act 1. Sess. 1. Par. 2.* of *K. Ch. 2d.*, to which the Bishops gave their Approbation and Consent.

CHAP. II. Of the Authors Opinion concerning Baptism, and of the State of the Controversie.

ACcording to the Method proposed, I shall begin with the Necessity of Baptism to Salvation. The Doctrine of the Church of Scotland in this Point is manifest from their Confession of Faith, *Chap. 28. Of Baptism, § 5.* "Al-
" though it be a great Sin, to contemn or neglect this Ordinance, yet
" Grace and Salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no Person can
" be

“ be Regenerated or Saved without it, or that all that are Baptised are undoubtedly
 “ Regenerated. § 6. The Efficacy of Baptism is not tyed to that Moment of Time,
 “ wherein it is Administred, yet notwithstanding, by the right use of this Ordinance,
 “ the Grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited, and conferred by the
 “ Holy Ghost, to such (whether of Age or Infants) as that Grace belongeth unto,
 “ according to the Counsel of Gods own will, in his appointed time. In the short
 Confession, composed by Order of K. Ja. 6. and subscribed by the King, his House-
 hold, and all Ranks in the Nation, about the Year 1581, are these Words, “ But in
 “ in special we detest and refuse the usurped Authority of the *Roman* Antichrist, —
 “ His cruel Judgment against Infants departing without the Sacrament; His absolute
 “ Necessity of Baptism. In the Directory for Publick Worship, approved by the
 General Assembly *Anno* 1645, concerning the Administration of Baptism, the Mini-
 ster is directed to teach, “ That the Seed and Posterity of the Faithful, born within
 “ the Church, are Christians, and Federally Holy, before Baptism, and therefore
 “ are they Baptised. That the Inward Grace and Vertue of Baptism is not tyed to
 “ that very Moment of Time, wherein it is administred, and that Outward Baptism
 “ is not so necessary, that through the want thereof, the Infant is in Danger of Dam-
 “ nation, or the Parents guilty, if they do not condemn or neglect the Ordinance of
 “ Christ, when and where it may be had.

This is the plain and professed Doctrine of the *Scots* Presbyterians, and I crave this
 Author may adduce an Instance of any one Reformed Church, that contradicts or con-
 demneth it. Yea on the contrary it is maintained and defended by the Generality of
 Reformed Divines, in Opposition to Papists and some rigid Ubiquitaries. And when
 this is the current Doctrine of Divines in all the Reformed Churches, it must be ei-
 ther Ignorance, or at least scarce fair Dealing, to represent it as peculiar to the *Scots*
 Presbyterians. But it seems the Presbyterians are so contemptible and odious in the
 Eyes of this Author, that he thinks it sufficient to beget a prejudice against any Opini-
 on, he resolves to impugn, if he represent it as the Doctrine of the *Scots* Presbyterians.

For Vindication of this Doctrine from the Charge of gross Error, it will be requisite
 to enquire into this Authors Opinion. And that this may be done with all Candor and
 Ingenuity, I shall exhibit the following Propositions in his own Words.

Prop. 1. Concerning the Necessity of Baptism, he affirms, *P. 7.* “ That Baptism is
 “ so necessary to all, who are, or will be saved, upon the ordinary Covenanted Gospel
 “ Terms of Salvation, that without it, none are saved upon these Terms. And, *P.*
11. circa fin. “ That Unbaptised Persons want something very necessary to Salvation,
 “ as Salvation is provided and offered in the Gospel.

Prop. 2. As to the Fruits of Baptism, he asserts, *P. 7.* “ That the Holy Spirit is
 “ conferred in Baptism, and, *P. 10.* “ That Remission of Sins is frequently, in the
 “ New Testament, attributed to Baptism. *P. 11.* He maintains the great Necessity
 “ of Baptism for the Remission of Sins, and consequently for putting perishing Sinners
 “ into a Salvable Condition.

Prop. 3. As to the Vertue and Efficacy of Baptism, in producing these Fruits, *P.*
7. He makes it the only Means, in these Words, “ The Holy Spirit and Remission of
 “ Sins, are, in the New Testament, said to be conferred in Baptism, and, in no place
 “ of the New Testament, said to be conferred by any other Covenanted and institut-
 “ ed ordinary Means, antecedent to, and independent upon Baptism. *P. 8.* That
 “ our Blessed Saviour hath made it the Property of Baptism, to confer the Spirit. *P.*
 “ 10. That the Holy Spirit is conferred in Baptism, and there is no other ordinary
 “ Means for conferring Him, provided and instituted by our Blessed Saviour in his
 “ Gospel, antecedent to, and independent upon Baptism. *P. 11.* That the Sacred
 “ Rite of Baptism was the only ordinary Means of Remission. And, *P. 13.* He asks

“ what Means has our Blessed Saviour provided and instituted in the Gospel, for putting us in a State of Holiness and Life, and applying the Merit of his Blood to us for obtaining Remission; without which we cannot be saved, antecedent to, and independent upon Baptism?”

Prop. 4. As to the State of Unbaptised Persons, he affirms, *P. 7.* “ That the Holy Spirit is, in the Gospel, said to be so given in Baptism, that he cannot be said to have the Spirit, who is not baptised. *P. 9.* “ That the Covenanted Right to the Holy Ghost was ordinarily given in Baptism; and that none, who had not first received Baptism in the Outward Symbol, were, upon the ordinary Gospel Terms, qualified to receive the Holy Ghost. *P. 11.* “ That the Gospel concludes all Men under Sin, and therefore in a perishing Condition, (even tho they do repent and forsake their Sins) until they are washed in this Laver. Yea further, he maintains, *P. 11.* and *12.* “ That an Adult Person of 50, or 60, Years, who has sincerely believed, and openly professed the Christian Religion, and behaved very harmlessly: Yet, being never baptised, is not in a Salvable Condition, nor qualified for the Vision of God, and the Society of the Triumphant Host in Heaven, upon the Covenanted and Revealed Gospel Terms, as long as he is, upon the same Terms, unqualified for the Communion of the Saints Militant upon Earth, for want of Baptism.

Prop. 5. As to the Children of Christian Parents in particular, he affirms, *P. 12.* “ That they are in a Federal Disposition to receive Baptism, when ever they are born, but not in a Salvable Condition, upon the ordinary revealed Gospel Terms of Salvation, as long as they are Unbaptised. That, while they want Baptism, they want something that is necessary to make them Christians.

For further clearing of this Contraverſie, these things may be observed.

1. That by Baptism, this Author understands the outward Sacred Rite, as distinct from the inward Grace signified by it, or Baptism in the outward Symbol, as he himself frequently calleth it.

2. The Question is not, if Baptism hath the Necessity of a Commandment, which the other Sacrament hath also: As *Bellarmino* himself acknowledges, *Disput. Tom. 3. Lib. 1. de Baptismo, Cap. 4. Nulla questio est, quin Baptismus sit necessarius ad salutem ex Divino Christi mandato. Sed Controversia est, an sit necessarius ut medium ad salutem, ita ut si quis non baptizetur, pereat, &c.* But if it be a necessary Means? Presbyterians acknowledge also, that Baptism is an instituted outward Means, but not so necessary, that none are saved without it. They deny, that it hath the same Degree of Necessity with Regeneration, or Remission of Sins, without which none can be saved. And in this Sense it is, that, without any Force, they acknowledge Baptism necessary by Command, but not absolutely and indispensibly necessary to Salvation.

3. When our Author says, *P. 7.* “ They will not escape with this Distinction, if we can prove against them, That Baptism is so necessary to all, who are or will be saved, upon the ordinary Covenanted Gospel Terms of Salvation, that, without it, none are saved upon these Terms; It had been fit, he had explained his *Ordinary Covenanted Gospel Terms of Salvation.* For my part, I know no *Extraordinary Covenanted Gospel Terms*, nor know I any Terms of Salvation, but what do belong to the Covenant of Grace, and are revealed in the Gospel. The Covenanted Terms of Salvation, as I conceive, comprehend all these things, which God requires in order to the Salvation of Sinners, and without which they cannot be saved; Such are the Mediation of Jesus Christ, Regeneration by the Spirit, and Justification by free Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ. And moreover, in the Adult, there is required Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and Repentance toward God. And if a Person obtain these things, I should think, he were saved upon the ordinary Covenanted Gospel Terms of Salvation, tho he should happen to die Unbaptised. I can scarcely

scarcely believe, that our Author judges Baptism to be the only Covenanted Term or Condition of Salvation; Though he doth indeed affirm, *P. 11. and 12. That a Man is not in a Salvable Condition, if he want Baptism, albeit he sincerely believe, repent and forsake his Sins.* From his chief Argument, which is, *That the Holy Spirit, and Remission of Sins, are said to be conferred in Baptism.* I think it more probable, that, by the Covenanted Terms of Salvation, he understands the Spirit of Regeneration and Remission of Sins. And if so, the meaning of his Proposition will be, *That without Baptism, none are saved on these Terms,* that is, without Baptism, none are saved through the Regeneration of the Spirit and Remission of their Sins. And if any Unbaptised Person be saved without these Terms of Salvation, I acknowledge with him, *P. 13. it must be in an Extraordinary and Uncovenanted Manner.* For hitherto I thought, that, *in no wise,* could enter into the *New Jerusalem,* any thing that defileth. And such are all Unrenewed and Unpardoned Sinners. Our Authors Hope is, *P. 14. That Children dying Unbaptised are saved,* because this seems more agreeable to the Essential Goodness and Infinite Mercy of God. But if they be not saved on the Covenanted Terms of Regeneration and Remission of their Sins, I see no Ground for his Hope: Its true, he says, this amounts to no more than a Probability. But, for my part, I know no Ground of Probability, that Infinite Mercy will save even Children, but upon the Covenanted Terms of Salvation, that the Pollution of their Original Sin be washed away by Regeneration, and the Guilt of it by Application of the Merit of the Blood of Christ in their Pardon. If I have mistaken his meaning, he may, with the next, vouchsafe us a more plain Explication of his Mind in this Matter. But whatever be of this, he seems, at least, to make Baptism a Covenanted Condition of Salvation, of no less Necessity than Regeneration and Remission of Sins, seeing he makes it a necessary Cause of them.

4. Hence the chief Hinge of this Controversie lyes in the second and third Propositions, concerning the Fruits and Efficacy of Baptism; whereupon depends the Question about its Necessity, and the State of the Unbaptised. If it should be enquired, what kind of Cause Baptism is, with respect to Regeneration and Remission, or how it conferreth these Benefits, if it produceth these Effects by some Natural or Supernatural Vertue contained in the Element of Water, or by Divine Grace assistent in the Act of Baptising? I can answer nothing from our Author's Print, who seems to have been as careful, as the Council of *Trent* was, to wrapt it up in a General. However, as we heard before, it is the Property of Baptism, to confer the Spirit and Remission of Sins. Nor doth he directly and plainly determine the Extent of this Efficacy of Baptism, if it conferreth them to every one that is Baptised, tho he asserts it expressly, in *P. 14. as to Children, that die before they are guilty of Actual Sin.* However, he plainly affirms, that the Holy Spirit and Remission of Sins are conferred in Baptism, and that they are not conferred by any other Covenanted and Instituted ordinary Means, antecedent to, and independent on Baptism; Yea, that he cannot be said to have the Spirit, who is not Baptised. Whereas our Confession saith, That Grace and Salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no Person can be Regenerated, or saved without it, or that all that are Baptised are undoubtedly Regenerated.

CHAP. III. *The First and Chief Argument for the Necessity of Baptism Examined.*

From what hath been said, the Controversie in hand comes to this Point: If, according to the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace, Outward Baptism be so necessary for conferring of Regeneration and Remission of Sins, that none are Regenerated or Pardoned without it? He affirms it is, Presbyterians deny it.

Wherefore I shall, in the next place, consider the Proofs he adduceth for establishing his Opinion.

His chief Argument lyes in this Complex Proposition, *viz.* "That the Holy Spirit and Remission of Sins are conferred in Baptism, and not by any other Covenanted and Instituted ordinary Means, antecedent to and independent upon Baptism. Hence he inferreth this Conclusion, "That therefore Baptism is so necessary to all, who are or will be saved upon the ordinary Covenanted Gospel Terms of Salvation, that, without it, none are saved on these Terms.

This Proposition I shall consider, both as to its Sense, and as to its Connexion with the Conclusion he draws from it.

In the first Branch of his Proposition, which is the affirmative part of it; By the *Holy Spirit*, I suppose he means Regeneration, or being born again of the Spirit. And when he says, *That the Holy Spirit and Remission of Sins are conferred in Baptism*; This being an indefinite Proposition, it may be understood either thus, That Regeneration and Remission are sometimes conferred in Baptism, yet so, that the Divine Grace is not tyed and confined to that Outward Rite, but that the Benefits of Regeneration and Remission may be denyed to some tho' Baptised, and bestowed on others before Baptism, and on others long after they are Baptised. In this Sense, it will not bear the weight of his Conclusion: For if some may be Baptised, and yet not Regenerated and Pardoned, and if others may be Regenerated and Pardoned without Baptism, then it is not so necessary, but that some may be saved without it, and that on the ordinary Covenanted Gospel Terms of Salvation, if the Regeneration of the Spirit and Remission of Sins be allowed to pass for such Terms of Salvation. Or his meaning may be, (and must be, if it infer the Conclusion,) That the Divine Grace is so tyed to the Outward Symbol, That Regeneration and Remission are never conferred before or after it, but only and alwise in and by Baptism. In this second Sense, the Affirmative part of his Complex Proposition is denyed.

As to the Negative part, our Author thinks himself not concerned in the Proof of it, the Affirmative part only being his Task. I acknowledge, if he shall prove the Affirmative in the second Sense above-mentioned, he may be the less Solicitous about the Negative: For the Affirmative, in that Sense, will easily infer the Negative. Yet, till that be proven, we may enquire into the meaning of this. If his meaning herein be, That Regeneration and Remission are not conferred by any other Covenanted and Instituted ordinary *Outward Means*, antecedent to, and independent upon Baptism, then I deny the Consequence of his Argument: For tho' it were granted, that there are no other outward ordinary Means, yet if a Person may obtain these Benefits by the Covenanted and Instituted inward ordinary Means, antecedent to, and independent upon Baptism, his Argument falleth, seeing he that is saved without Baptism, through the Renewing of the Holy Ghost and Remission of Sins, is saved upon ordinary Covenanted Terms of Salvation. If he understands, by the Negative part of his Proposition, That Regeneration and Remission of Sins are not conferred by any other

other ordinary Means, whether Inward or Outward, antecedent to, and independent upon Baptism: Then I think it false. And feigning he says, I am obliged, by the Rules of Argument, to prove it so, by assigning the ordinary Means provided and instituted by our Blessed Saviour in the Gospel, for conferring these Benefits, antecedent to, and independent upon Baptism, I shall assign, First, the Mediation and Merits of Jesus Christ, with the Grace of his Spirit, for bestowing and applying the Benefits of Regeneration and Remission of Sins, which were purchased by his Merits. These are ordinary Means provided and instituted in the Covenant of Grace, without which, I think, he will grant, that none can be saved upon the ordinary Covenanted Gospel Terms of Salvation, and yet are they antecedent to, and independent upon Baptism. Secondly, Prayer is an ordinary Means instituted in the Gospel, as also the Word read and preached, or the Gospel Call, the Precepts, Promises and Threatnings of the Word. These are outward Means, antecedent to, and independent upon Baptism. And tho' the Word be not a Mean to Infants, yet it is to the Adult, for it is to be observed, (as we shall shew afterwards,) that this Argument respects the Adult, as well as Infants. And if these Means now assigned be antecedent to, and independent upon Baptism, our Author loses the Cause, by his own Concession, for, P. 13. he says, *If there be any, let it be assigned, and the Controversie is ended.*

However, having denied both parts of his Complex Proposition, in the Sense above-expressed, let us hear, how he proves the Affirmative part, which is the Task he undertakes to perform.

First he proves, that the Holy Spirit is conferred in Baptism, This, says he, is clear from Tit. 3. 5. where Baptism is called, *The washing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.* This is all the Proof he brings from this Text: If it was clear to himself, he might have made it some clearer to others also. To me it remains still very dark. For, (1.) There is no mention of Baptism in the Text. How doth he then prove, that Baptism is called the Washing of Regeneration? How is it clear, that it is called the Renewing of the Holy Ghost? (2.) Supposing that Baptism were here so called, How doth he hence prove, that the Holy Spirit is conferred in Baptism, and that alwise and only in Baptism, and not before it? For Baptism may be called the *Laver of Regeneration*, as the Sign and Seal that presupposeth and confirmeth this Grace; tho' it be not the Cause or Means that conferreth it. (3.) When in this Text, God is said to save us by the *Washing of Regeneration*, I desire to know, whether our Author understands this Phrase of Outward or Inward Baptism? If it denoteth Baptism in the Outward Symbol, and not the Inward Baptism of Regeneration, How will he hence prove, that it conferreth Inward Baptism or the Spirit of Regeneration, which, on this Supposition, is not understood by this Phrase? If it denoteth the Inward Baptism of the Spirit, (as it truly doth,) then is it not to be understood of Baptism in the Outward Symbol, which is the Point under Debate. (4.) When it is here said, *That He saved us by the Washing or Laver of Regeneration*, all that can be drawn from it, when he hath squeezed it to the uttermost, is, that the Inward Grace is expressed by the Name of the Outward Sign. And this is most frequent in Scripture, in all the Sacramental Phrases. If from this he will conclude, that Outward Baptism conferreth the Inward Grace, whereof it is the Sign and Seal: He may, with the same Reason, prove Transubstantiation, from the like Sacramental Phrase, when it is said of the Bread in the Lords Supper, *This is my Body.* And the Text here explains it self, for tho' the Word *Laver* may be borrowed from the Outward Symbol, yet, that we may know, that it is not meant of the Laver of Water in the Outward Sign, it is called *the Laver of Regeneration and Renewing of the Holy Ghost.* And in this Sense is the Text explained by the most eminent Reformed Divines.

In the next place, he undertakes to prove, *That the Holy Spirit is, in the Gospel, said to be so given in Baptism, that he cannot be said to have the Spirit, who is not Baptized. And this (says he) is more than we are concerned to prove.* And I think it is no more, for if he prove the Positive part in the Sense above-mentioned, it is the same as if he proved the Negative. But how proves he this? "The Words of our B. Saviour himself to *Nicodemus*, in *Joh. 3. 5.* are a clear Proof of it; For, there he joins Baptism and the Holy Spirit together, and by his Decretory Sentence, makes both so necessary to Salvation, that he declares, with a re-doubled *Verily*, that, without Baptism in the Outward Symbol, and the Spirit, none can be saved, *Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.*

In Answer to which, I observe, 1. That our Author pretends here to overdo, but I think he outdoes and undoes himself, seeing, if this Argument be good, it subverts all his Hopes of the Salvation of Children that die Unbaptized, which he expresseth, *P. 14.* For if our B. Saviour, by his Decretory Sentence, hath made Baptism, as well as the Spirit, necessary, with a re-doubled *Verily*: What Warrant hath he, to hope for the Salvation of Infants against this *Decretory Sentence*? Dares he contradict our Blessed Saviour, in what he declares with a re-doubled *Verily*? By what Authority doth he make an Exception of Unbaptized Infants, when our Lord makes none? He cannot say, that Children dying Unbaptized are saved, when Christ excludes them the Kingdom of God, even tho he should provide a *Limbus Infantum*, for the place of their Eternal Residence, seeing here he makes Salvation, and entering into the Kingdom of God, to be one and the same.

Observe 2. The whole Strength of this Argument lyes in this, that *Water* denotes Baptism in the Outward Symbol. *Bellarmino* and the rest of the Popish Doctors, who use the same Arguments with our Author in this Matter, do understand it of the Sacrament of Baptism. *Calvin, Peter Martyr, Pareus, Gomarus, Heideger, Spanheim*, with the current of Reformed Divines, by *Water* here, understand the Spirit himself, with respect to the manner of his Operation in our New Birth. *Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, i. e. by the Holy Spirit*, who, by his cleansing Vertue, doth purge away the Filth and Pollution of Sin from the Soul, even as *Water* doth the outward Spots and Filth of the Body. Our Author brings no Reason from the Text, for confirming his Gloss, as if we were to receive it upon his Assertion. But I shall offer some of these Reasons, I judge most weighty, for establishing the true Sense of our Saviours Words. (1.) It is not unusual in Scripture, that one and the same thing is expressed in two Words by a *Hendiadys*, as *Mat. 3. 11.* *He shall Baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire, i. e. The Holy Spirit*, that purges away Corruption, as *Fire* doth Dross: So here *Water* and the Spirit signify the same thing, the one Term being Metaphorick, and the other proper, and both are joined to signify both the Author of our New Birth, and the manner of his Working. (2.) That the Holy Ghost is here meant by these two equipollent Terms, and not outward Baptism, appears from the following sixth and eighth Verses, where our Lord further explains his Mind, in mentioning the same effect twice, and ascribes it to the Spirit alone, *v. 6.* *That which is born of the Spirit is Spirit*, and, *v. 8.* *So is every one that is born of the Spirit.* (3.) It is not unusual, that the Holy Spirit is designed by *Water*, *Is. 44. 3.* *I will pour Water upon him that is thirsty, — I will pour my Spirit upon thy Seed.* *Ezek. 36. 25.* *Then will I sprinkle clean Water upon you*, which is explained, *v. 27.* *I will put my Spirit within you.* Here *Water* and the Spirit, in the same Passages, denote the same thing. (4.) The Baptism of *Water* cannot be here meant, seeing, even according to the Concession of Adversaries, it was not yet necessary, when these Words were spoken to *Nicodemus*.

Bellar-

Bellarmino grants, it was not necessary before the Promulgation of it in the Day of Pentecost. And our Author, in his *Specimen of the Method the Presbyterians, &c.* P. 2. calleth Baptism a Divine Evangelical Institution delivered by our Blessed Saviour to his Apostles, as one of his great and last Commands, when he taught them the things concerning his Kingdom: Which being after Christs Resurrection, makes Baptism of a posterior date to this Conference with *Nicodemus*. (5.) The thing our Lord is here teaching *Nicodemus*, was such as he might and should have known, seeing his Ignorance therein is sharply reprov'd, v. 10. *Art thou a Master in Israel, and knowest not these things?* Now he might have known the Necessity of Regeneration, of the New Heart and New Spirit, and that the Spirit of God was promised under the Similitude of Water. But he could not be blamed, for not knowing the Necessity of Outward Baptism, seeing that Evangelical Institution was not yet delivered by our Blessed Saviour to his Apostles, as one of his great and last Commands. And therefore Outward Baptism cannot be here understood. And if Baptism, in the Outward Symbol, be not made necessary by this *Decretory Sentence*, he'll never be able to prove, that our Blessed Saviour hath determined its Necessity, by any Command delivered after his Resurrection.

Observe 3. If this Argument from *Joh. 3. 5.* hold good, it respects the Adult as well as Infants, and proves, that none of them can be said to have the Spirit, unless they be Baptized. And that our Author understands it thus, is plain from what he says in Prosecution of this Argument, P. 8. "And he (*viz.* our Blessed Saviour) "places Baptism first in order before the Spirit, plainly insinuating, that he hath "not only made both necessary to all, that will enter into the Kingdom of God, "but made it likewise the Property of Baptism to confer the Spirit. If Baptism be first in order before the Spirit, and if it be the Property of Baptism to confer the Spirit, then the Adult cannot be supposed to be born of the Spirit, before they are Baptized. It is plain also from the Texts he adduceth in Confirmation of this Gloss, which directly respect the Adult: For such were *Peters Hearers*, *Acts 2.* such were the Disciples of *John*, *Acts 19.* such was *Cornelius*, *Acts 10.* I think our Author deserves the Praise of this peculiar Opinion, whereby he carries the Efficacy and Necessity of Baptism higher, than either Papists or Protestants ever did, who wrote upon this Subject. *Bellarmino*, *Disput. Tom. 3. de Sacram. Lib. 2. Cap. 1.* says of the Catholicks, *Nec tamen ideo sequitur eos, &c.* Notwithstanding it doth not therefore follow, that they exclude Faith and Repentance in the Adult, for these are required in the Adult as Dispositions. And, *de Baptismo, Lib. Cap. 8. Requiritur quidam, &c.* There is indeed required in the Adult, some certain Disposition by actual Faith and Conversion unto God. If, in the Opinion of Papists, actual Faith and Conversion unto God be presupposed unto Baptism in the Adult, it seems clear, that they suppose them to be born of the Spirit, before they are Baptized.

Samuel Ward, sometime Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, tho, as to Infants, he maintain, That Baptism doth alwise confer the Remission of Original Guilt, yet, as to the Adult, he is of another Opinion. *Determin. Theolog. P. 45.* Speaking of the Adult that receive the Sacrament, he says, *Ut autem quis idoneus fiat, &c.* But to make a Man fit, several Dispositions are required, as, Catholick Faith, Hope of Pardon, Fear of Punishment, Sorrow for Sins committed, a Purpose for the future not to Sin, a Purpose of New Life, all which fit and dispose the Receiver. But moreover there is required true and lively Faith in Christ the Mediator for Remission of Sins, by which Means alone the Redemption of Christ is instrumentally applyed unto the Remission of Sins. And, in this, Doctor *Ward* determines nothing, but what is consonant to the Doctrine of the Church of England, in Art. 27. of Baptism. It is also a Sign of Regeneration or New Birth, whereby — Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased, by vertue

of Prayer unto God. Here Faith and Grace, which suppose the New Birth, are made antecedent to Baptism. Wherefore, if the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland be of our Authors Opinion, (which I shall not believe, till it be further declared,) they stand condemned in the Judgment of the Church of England, as to this Point of Baptism.

However, we may hear what he says for confirming this his singular Opinion, Pag. 8. " and that this much was intended by him (our Blessed Saviour) must be granted by our Brethren, if they'll allow that St. Peter understood his Mind sufficiently, and was infallibly secured from Error in delivering it on the Day of Pentecost, and I think they must grant he was so then, if ever ; For, being then filled with the Holy Ghost, and consequently infallibly guided, he Exhorts his Auditors, To Repent and be Baptized every one of them in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and they should receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost, Acts 2. 38.

This long flourish of St. Peters Infallibility makes nothing to the purpose, Presbyterians do not in the least question his Infallible guidance, tho' they think themselves not obliged to give the like Credit to every gloss this Author may impose upon his Words. But our Authors great quarrel with Presbyterians seems rather to be, that they pay too much deference to the Oracles of God, seeing he so often comes over this Cant in his Pamphlet, and in his Preface, he says, " None pretend more to be determined in all controversies in Religion by the Sacred Scriptures, so as to decline the Testimony of venerable Antiquity, than our present Scots Presbyterians. Our Author may mock and revile them on this account as much as he will, yet they account it no Reproach. Yea, they are not ashamed to maintain against Papists and all who symbolize with them, that the Holy Scriptures are the Rule and only Rule of Faith, and that Antiquity, how venerable soever, is not to be received in Opposition to these Sacred Oracles. And as to the Question in hand, about the necessity of Baptism, if our Author pleases in his next Essay to enter upon it, Presbyterians will never decline the Tryal, whether he or they have the best Claim to the Testimony of venerable Antiquity. This may suffice once for all, hereafter I shall not reckon my self obliged to notice the Reflections of this kind that frequently occur in his Pamphlet. But to the purpose,

Our Question is not about the Apostles infallible guidance, but if in his Words Acts 2. 38. he places Baptism first in order before the Spirit, and makes it the Property of Baptism to confer the Spirit? Our Author affirms it ; and for evincing the contrary, I shall only make two Remarks. (1.) That Evangelical Repentance and Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, were required of Peters hearers as Antecedent to their being Baptized. For being pricked in their heart, v. 37. Peter said unto them, Repent and be Baptized, v. 38. and v. 41. Then they that gladly received his word, were Baptized. These Graces were Fruits of the Spirit, wrought in them by means of the word, Antecedent to, and Independent upon Baptism. They were therefore supposed to be born of the Spirit, before they were Baptized ; unless our Author will maintain, that a Man may Repent and believe the Gospel by the natural power of Free-will, without the influence of the Spirit. (2.) That, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, here promised upon their Repenting and being Baptized, is to be understood of the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit poured out at that time ; at least, it cannot be understood of the first Grace of Regeneration, and the new Birth, which they are supposed to have had before Baptism.

The next proof he adduceth is from Acts 19. 1. -----6. concerning some, who before were Baptized with John's Baptism, whom (he says) St. Paul first Baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and then he laid his hands upon them, and the Holy Ghost fell on them ; and they spake with Tongues and Prophesied.

I shall not here enter upon that other Popish Controversie, about the Nature and Efficacy of *John's* Baptism, and if his Disciples were Re-baptized: But supposing they were, this passage makes nothing to his purpose: For these Disciples of *John* were supposed to have had Faith and Repentance, *v. 4.* and in *v. 6.* The Holy Ghost, (which is attributed, not to their Baptism, but to the laying on of the Apostles hands) is plainly meant of the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, whereby they spake with Tongues and Prophefied. Hence we may see, how unhappy our Author is in citing these Texts, which prove the quite contrary of what he would draw from them.

Our Author to secure his Argument from all Exception, pretends to answer an Objection, *pag. 8.* "But our Presbyterian Brethren may say, The Holy Ghost was sometimes given before Baptism. I grant it, as in the instance of *Cornelius* and his Company, Recorded in *Acts 10.*

But I shall cast the Objection in another Mould, which, if he pleases, he may Answer with the next. If the Spirit of Regeneration, whereby Sinners are born again, was alwise supposed to be given before Baptism, and if the Graces of Faith and Repentance, which are the Fruits of the Spirit, be, in the New Testament, required as Qualifications in the Persons to be Baptized: Then Baptism is not first in order before the Spirit, nor is it the Property of Baptism to confer the Spirit. That it was so in *Peters* hearers, *Acts 2.* we have observed already. As to *Cornelius* and his Company, *Acts 10.* our Author grants it. It is said of the *Samaritans*, *Acts 8. 12.* when they believed, --- they were Baptized. And even the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost were not conferred upon them at their Baptism, but sometime after by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles *Peter* and *John*. Faith was required of the *Eunuch* before Baptism, *Acts 8. 37.* If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest. *Paul* was Converted, prayed and had Revelations of the Spirit before he was Baptized, *Acts 9.* The Heart of *Lydia* was opened before her Baptism, *Acts 16. 14.* The *Sailor* is required to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, before the Sacrament of Baptism was Administred unto him, *Acts 16. 31.* *Crispus* and the *Corinthians* believed and were Baptized, *Acts 18. 8.* In all these instances we see that the New-Birth was Antecedent to outward Baptism. That Christians were ordinarily Baptized before they received the Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, I shall easily grant: But I do not expect, that our Author shall be able to give an instance of any one in all the New Testament, who was Baptized without the previous profession of Faith and Repentance. From what hath been said, our Authors Discourse concerning *Cornelius*, appears to be so little to the purpose, that I shall supersede any further Answer to it. Upon all which, let the Impartial Reader judge how firmly he hath proved, that it is the property of Baptism to confer the Spirit.

CHAP. IV. His other Arguments Canvassed.

THE second point he undertakes to prove is, That Remission of Sins is attributed to Baptism. And this we may consider as his Second Argument for its Necessity. *p. 10.* "I think (says he) the instance of *St. Paul* (recorded in *Chap. 9.* and *22.* of the *Acts*) is so clear a proof of it, that they must be unaccountably blind and prejudicated, who will not be convinced by it. Tho' he was Converted, yet he was not Absolved from the Guilt of his Sins, but directed to the ordinary means instituted for obtaining Remission, Arise and go into the City and it shall be told thee what thou must do, *Acts 9. 6.* And, that the

" the Sacred Rite of Baptism was the only ordinary means, is evident from what
 " Ananias said to him ; Arise and be Baptized, and wash away thy Sins, *Acts*
 " 22. 16.

I freely profess I am not yet convinced by all that he hath said ; If it be through
 my *unaccountable blindness and prejudice*, I shall leave it to others to judge from the
 Answers I shall suggest.

1. By our Authors own Concession, Conversion did precede Baptism ; which over-
 turns his former Argument from *John* 3. 5. For I suppose he will not refuse, that to
 be *Converted*, and to be *born of the Spirit* are one and the same. But in this instance
 the New Birth was Antecedent to Baptism, and therefore he falsely affirmed before,
 that Baptism is first in order before the Spirit, and that it is the property of Bap-
 tism to confer the Spirit.

2. The Apostle *Paul* was a sincere Convert and true Believer before he was Bap-
 tized. But according to the Doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, the Remission
 of Sins, which consists in the Gracious Sentence and Judgement of God absolving
 from Guilt, is inseparably annexed unto Faith in Christ, *Acts* 10. 43. *To him give all*
the Prophets Witness, that through his Name, whosoever believeth in him, shall receive
Remission of Sins. *Acts* 13. 39. *And by him all that believe are justified, &c.* And
Rom. 3. 28. *Therefore we conclude that a Man is justified by Faith.* Wherefore as
Abraham was justified by Faith before Circumcision, which he afterward received
 as a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised,
Rom. 4. 10, 11. So *Paul* was justified by his Faith before Baptism, which Sacrament
 he received as a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith he had yet being unbap-
 tized.

3. Our Author asserts, That Baptism is the only ordinary means of Remission,
 and says it is evident from *Acts* 22. 16. *Arise and be Baptized and wash away thy Sins.*
 But it is not enough to lay down a position, and adduce a Text for its Confirmation,
 unless he can shew how that Scripture makes for his purpose, and proves his point.
 Here indeed Baptism and the washing away of Sins are joined together. But (1.)
 How doth he hence infer that *Baptism is the only ordinary means instituted for obtain-*
ing the Remission of Sins ? Hath not God instituted and appointed the Blood of
 Christ to be the means of cleansing us from all Sin ? Hath not Christ instituted Faith
 to be the means of applying the Merits of his Blood and so of obtaining the Remis-
 sion of Sins ? How then is Baptism the only means ? Will he say that Baptism is the
 the only ordinary means, and that the Blood of Christ and Faith are extraordinary
 means ? If so, he must give a new Sense to these usual Terms. (2.) How doth he
 hence prove that Baptism is a means of obtaining Remission ? For the washing a-
 way of Sins may be attributed to Baptism as a Sign and Seal, for Signifying, Seal-
 ing, Confirming, and Intimating this benefite, tho it be not the Cause or Means, far
 less the *only Means* of conferring the Remission of Sins. (3.) How doth he hence
 prove, that the Remission of Sins is attributed to Baptism ? For tho Baptism and the
 washing away of Sins be joined together in this Text, yet it is not said, *wash away thy*
Sins by the outward Water of Baptism. And seeing it is not expressly attributed to out-
 ward Baptism, whymay it not be understood, to be attributed unto the Blood of Christ,
 which is the true Fountain open for Sin and for Uncleanness, to which the Remis-
 sion of Sins is frequently ascribed, in Scripture, and which is represented in the out-
 ward Water of Baptism. Whereas Water in Baptism may wash away the Filth of the
 Body, but it is as impossible for it to reach the Pollutions of the Soul, as that the
 Blood of Bulls and Goats should take away Sins. It might have been expected, that
 instead of barely alledging this Text, he should have evinced from it, That *Remis-*
sion of Sins is attributed to Baptism, that it is attributed to Baptism as the Means, and

as the only ordinary Means of obtaining Forgiveness of Sins. Which seeing he hath not done, his Argument remains lame and Defective.

4. To yield all that can be reasonably demanded in this Matter, we shall suppose that Remission of Sins is attributed to Baptism. And when this is granted, from these Words, *Arise and be Baptized, and wash away thy Sins*, it will not follow, that the Sacred Rite of Baptism is the only ordinary Means of Remission, or that he had not before received the pardon of Sin upon his Conversion and Belief in Christ: But all that can justly be inferred is, that the Grace of Forgiveness is ascribed to Baptism as the Outward Sign and Seal of it, according to the usual Figure in all the Sacramental Phrases: And that the Meaning is, receive an Efficacious Confirming Seal of the washing away of thy Sins, whereby also thy Faith shall be strengthened in the constant applying unto Christ, that, by vertue of his Blood, and Power of his Grace, both the Guilt and Defilement of thy Sins may be washen away. To the same purpose is this Sacramental Phrase explained by Learned Reformed Divines, *Marlorat, Gualter, Aretius, Pareus, &c.*

And this Exposition appears most agreeable to the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace, which gives Claim to and Interest in its promised Benefits, upon performance of the Conditions of Faith and Repentance: And most agreeable to the Nature of Remission, which is an Act of Free Grace, that cannot be tyed to the Moment of Baptism, or made dependent on the Will of the Administrator. It is also most agreeable to the Nature of Sacraments, which are Confirming Seals of the Covenanted Benefits; And a Seal and Confirmation presupposeth a prior Right to the Benefit Sealed and Confirmed. And finally, it is most agreeable to the Nature of Baptism in particular, wherein, unto the Element of Water, no other Washing away of Sins can properly be attributed, but what is Sacramental, that is, Significant and Obsignatory of the Inward Washing by Regeneration and Remission. From all which Considerations the Reader may judge, what ground our Author hath to build his Opinion on this Text, *Acts 22. 16.* And to whom the unaccountable Blindness and Prejudice is most justly imputable.

From this Instance he further concludes, *P. 11. That all Men are under Sin, and therefore in a perishing Condition, (even tho' they do repent and forsake their Sins,) until they are washed in this Laver.*

Here is some more new Doctrine, but abundantly Consequential to his former Positions. I thought Repentance and Remission of Sins had been inseparably connected together in the Gospel. But this Author teacheth otherwise, according to whose Doctrine, a Man may truly repent, and yet perish eternally, if he is not Baptized, tho' he be deprived of it through no Fault of his own. Our Lord taught, (*Luke 13. 3.*) *Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.* But I do not read any where, *Except ye be Baptized, ye shall all likewise perish.* He told his Disciples, *Luke 24. 47. That Repentance and Remission of Sins should be preached in his Name.* And his Apostles taught People to Repent, that their Sins might be blotted out, *Acts 3. 19.* And that Jesus was exalted to give Repentance unto Israel and Remission of Sins, *Acts 5. 31.* But, in our Authors Opinion, it seems we have been mistaken, while we thought, in these and the like Texts, that Remission of Sins was annexed to Repentance.

Our Authors following Words, in *P. 11.* may be considered as his *Third Argument*, proposed by way of Question; "Besides, I ask what our Brethren will make of those plain Texts, in *Gal. 3. 27. As many as are Baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* In *Col. 2. 12. Buried with Christ in Baptism, and risen with him in Baptism.* And in *1 Pet. 3. 20, 21.* where the Apostle makes the Comparison between *Noah's being saved in the Ark by Water, and our being saved by Baptism.* Are these New Testament Texts, Words spoke only at random, &c.

[As

As these are not Words spoken at random, so neither ought they to be cited at random, nor unfairly represented, as our Author doth that Passage of the Apostle *Peter*, which, if set in its full Light, might have scattered the Mist from his Eyes. Wherefore, to his Question, I Answer.

1. That Presbyterians make the same of these Texts, which the Apostle *Peter* himself doth, who maketh a plain Distinction betwixt Baptism in the Outward Symbol, and Inward Baptism, or the Grace signified and sealed by that Symbol: And ascribes our Salvation not to the Outward Rite, but to the Inward Grace, as is evident from his own Words, which our Author should have added; For having said, That *Baptism doth also now save us*, He addeth, *Not the putting away of the Filth of the Flesh*, (which is all that Water can do,) *but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*: Which is not the Effect of Outward Baptism, but of the Renewing Grace of the Spirit of God.

2. Presbyterians may make the same of these plain Texts, which the above-cited Doctor *Ward* makes of them, and the like Sacramental Phrases, *Determin. Theolog. P. 47, 48.* where, speaking of the Baptism of Adult Believers, he cites *Eph. 5. 26. Tit. 3. 5. Rom. 6. 3. 1 Cor. 6. 8.* and addeth, *Ex quibus satis liquet Baptismum, &c.* From which it is abundantly evident, that Baptism doth confer unto the Adult Cleansing, Salvation, Renovation, Regeneration, the Death of Sin; which cannot be understood of the first Renovation or Sanctification, or Mortification of Sin; for these do inseparably accompany the Remission of Sins. When therefore, as we now suppose, before Baptism they were truly converted, and had obtained the Remission of Sins, they obtained also true Regeneration and Renovation. And therefore these Texts are to be understood of a fuller and larger Measure of this Renewing Grace, — And again, *Hoc ipsum satis demonstrant ipsæ Formule loquendi Sacramentalis, &c.* The same is firmly enough demonstrated from the Sacramental Phrases, *Baptism washeth away Sin, is the Laver of Regeneration, doth save us, buried with him in Baptism, as many of you as have been Baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* For, by these Phrases drawn from the Signs unto the things signified, the Prophets and Apostles do prove, that the things promised in the Gospel do belong unto them, seeing they have received from God, and rightly, according to the Divine Institution, have used the Symbols of these things, which are no ways deceiving. I the more willingly cite Doctor *Ward*, because he, with *Hooker* and *Davenant*, whom *Le Blanc* follows, seem to come near to our Authors Opinion, with respect to Infant-Baptism. However, in this Case, Doctor *Ward* plainly determines against our Author, while he makes Regeneration and Remission of Sins antecedent to Baptism, and that agreeably to the Doctrine of the Church of England, who, in Article 27. affirm, That *Baptism is a Sign of Regeneration or New Birth, whereby, as by an Instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church; the Promises of the Forgiveness of Sins, of our Adoption to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed, Faith is confirmed, &c.* Here the Right unto Forgiveness which is sealed, and Faith which is confirmed, are plainly presupposed unto Baptism, which is said to Seal and Confirm them. So that, in our Authors Judgment, the Church of England is no less unaccountably Blind and Prejudicated, than the Scots Presbyterians, whom he charges with gross Error, and undertakes to confute.

What follows in the end of *P. 11.* and in *P. 12.* we may consider as our Authors Fourth Argument, which he proposeth for Illustration of the former. “Suppose an Adult Person of 30, or 60 Years, who (ever since he was of competent Age) has sincerely believed and openly professed the Christian Religion, and behaved very harmlessly, but we come at last to know, that he was never Baptized.

This

This Person, in his Opinion, is not in a Salvable Condition, nor qualified for the Vision of God in Heaven. But I crave leave to differ from him, I chuse rather to be of the Apostles Judgment, *Rom. 10. 9, 10. That if thou shalt confess with thy Mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine Heart, that God hath raised him from the Dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the Heart Man believeth unto Righteousness, and with the Mouth Confession is made unto Salvation.* He that thus believeth and confesseth Christ, is notwithstanding excluded by our Author from a Salvable State. But for my part, seing he hath the thing signified in Baptism, I dare not presume, against this plain Oracle of God, to exclude such an one, both from Righteousness and Salvation, for want of an External Rite. But why is he not qualified for the Vision of God? Because (saith he) upon the Covenanted and Revealed Gospel Terms, he is unqualified for the Communion of the Saints Militant upon Earth, for want of Baptism. And (says he) *I ask our Brethren, if, on their Conscience, they would think it safe, to admit him to the Participation of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, tho he earnestly sought it with Prayers and Tears, until he were Baptized?* I Answer, There is nothing appears to me in the Case, that needs straiten any Presbyterian Minister in his Conscience. I think such a Person is qualified for the Communion of Saints, and a Presbyterian Minister might admit him, both to Baptism and the Lords Supper at the same time (as was of old practised in the Christian Church) without any Scruple of Conscience, he having Right to both. As to the Covenanted Gospel Terms, he so often comes over, I shall not repeat what I have said already. I think Faith, Repentance, the Confessing of Christ, a Holy Life, are Terms of Salvation: And, in whomsoever these things are found, he shall be saved upon the Covenanted and Revealed Gospel Terms of Salvation.

CHAP. V. Of Infant Baptism in particular.

Hitherto I have examined the chief Foundations, on which our Author builds his Necessity of Baptism. His following Discourse doth particularly respect the Baptism of Infants: Which he brings in by way of Answer to an Objection he makes to himself, *P. 12.* "But our Brethren may say, the Children of Christian Parents (as such) are comprehended within the Gospel-Covenant, and consequently in a Salvable Condition upon the Terms of it, tho they die Unbaptized, The Promise being made to them, (*viz. Christian Parents,*) and to their Children, *Acts 2. 39.*"

Our Author Answers, That all that can be inferred from these Words of the Apostle is, that the Parents, being Christians, have a Federal Right to require the Benefit of Baptism to their Children, and the Children themselves are in a Federal Disposition to receive it, whenever they are born; But not, that the Children are in a Salvable Condition upon the ordinary Revealed Gospel Terms of Salvation, or that they are Christians, so long as they are Unbaptized. In Reply to which,

1. I wish our Author had explained what he means by a Federal Disposition, and a Salvable Condition, and how a Person may have a Federal Disposition, and yet not be in a Salvable Condition upon the Terms of the Covenant. These things I acknowledge, I do not well comprehend, If, by this Federal Disposition, he understands a Gracious Quality, or a Real Priviledge, How can this be allowed to such, as are not Christians? If he understands a Covenant Right to the Seal of Baptism, How can this be granted to such, as are not comprehended in the Covenant, nor in a Salvable Condition upon the Terms of it? Again, if, by a Salvable Condition, he

means, that their Salvation is possible, upon their fulfilling the Terms of the Covenant of Grace, (as the Words, in their common Acceptation, seem to import,) then I see not, how he can exclude *Turks* and *Pagans*, far less the Children of Christian Parents, from a Salvable Condition. If he take this in a stricter Sense, for such as have a Title to, and are in the way of Salvation, upon the Terms of the Covenant, then I see not, how he can exclude the Children of Christian Parents from this Salvable State, unless he shall say, that they are not comprehended in the Covenant, and that the Promises of it do not belong unto them. And if so, I know not what Federal or Covenant Disposition they can be in, to receive the Seal of the Covenant.

2. If the Children of Christian Parents are not Christians, while Unbaptized, then are they *without Christ*, and therefore *Aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel*, *Strangers from the Covenants of Promise*, *without Hope*, and *without God in the World*, *Eph. 2. 12.* And if this be the State of the Unbaptized Children of Christian Parents, I know no Real Privilege they have above *Turks* and *Heathens*, nor how the Promise is said to be made unto them. But, I hope, better Thoughts will be intertained of their Children by all true Christians, who believe the Promise of the Covenant, *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee.*

3. This Opinion of our Authors, denying the Unbaptized Infants of Christian Parents, to be Christians, or in a Salvable Condition, subverts the Foundation of Infant-Baptism; and thereby destroys what he was pretending to build, in furnishing its Adversaries, the *Anabaptists*, with a strong Argument against it. The *Orthodox* usually build Infant-Baptism upon this Ground, That the Covenant belongs unto Christian Children, that they have Communion with Christ, that of such is the Kingdom of Heaven, at least, in the Judgment of Charity, we ought to account them such, and therefore this Seal of the Covenant may warrantably be administered unto them. Having the Grace signified, they have Right to the Seal. But while our Author denies them these Privileges, the *Anabaptists* may argue against him thus, "Whosoever are not Christians, nor in a Salvable Condition, they ought not to have the Badge of Christianity, nor the Seal of Salvation: Who have no Right to the Covenant, nor Promises thereof, their Right cannot be visibly confirmed by the Instituted Seal: Who have no Pardon granted unto them, there is no Warrant to Sign their Remission: Who are not Heirs of the Kingdom, a Right to the Inheritance cannot be Sealed unto them: In a Word, whosoever have not Union with Christ, as his Members, nor Communion with him in his purchased Benefits, unto them the Sacrament of Baptism is not to be administered. But, in your Judgment, such are the Children of Christian Parents; They are not Christians, nor in a Salvable Condition, consequently they have no Right to the Covenant of Grace, nor Promises thereof, no Pardon of Sin is granted unto them, nor are they Heirs of the Kingdom, nor have they Union and Communion with Jesus Christ. Therefore, according to your Judgment, they ought not to be Baptized. The *Anabaptists*, who are against Baptizing of any Person, until of competent Age, may also urge him with this Argument, "*Turks* and *Heathens* are not to be Baptized, until once they be made Christians, *i. e.* Until they be brought by Faith to close with Christ in the Covenant of Grace for Remission of Sins, or at least make Profession thereof: But, in your Opinion, the Children of Christian Parents, being no Christians, nor in a Salvable Condition, are really no better, but equal to *Turks* and *Heathens*; Therefore such Children are not to be Baptized, until first they be made Christians, *i. e.* Until they actually believe, or at least make Profession of their Faith. This is what *Anabaptists* plead for. And that it may further appear, that I have not unjustly charged our Author with overturning the Foundation of Infant-Baptism, I shall only add, That, in the above-

cited

cited Text, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. the Apostle makes a Right to, and Interest in the Promises, the Ground and Reason of his Exhortation unto Baptism; *Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be Baptized, &c. For the Promise is unto you, and to your Children, &c.* Now if a Right unto, and Interest in the Promise, be the Ground of Baptism, then he that denies this Right unto Children, and so removes this Ground, he overturns the Baptism of Infants.

But how doth our Author prove that the Children of Christian Parents are not Christians? All I find for this is in these Words, *And I think it will be hard for our Brethren to prove by any thing revealed in the Gospel, that they are Christians, until they are Baptized in the Name of Christ.*

And from what is already said, I may retort, it will be hard for him to prove, by any thing revealed in the Gospel, that they ought to be Baptized in the Name of Christ, unless he shall allow them to be accounted Christians, and in a salvable condition upon the Terms of the Covenant of Grace. I think also the Objection which he started, and hath not Answered, doth furnish a proof of this, which I shall offer thus: These who are comprehended in the Gospel Covenant, and to whom the Promise belongs, who are sharers of the Blessings of Christ, and Heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven; They ought to be accounted Christians, and in a salvable condition upon the Terms of the Covenant. But such are the Children of Christian Parents; Therefore they are to be accounted Christians, and in a salvable condition. And if they be judged such, *can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be Baptized.*

In P. 13. we have, as it seems, a further Answer to the Objection, viz. Moreover St. Paul says in *Heb.* 12. 14. *That without Holiness no Man shall see the Lord.* But tho' there be a new Text cited, yet there is no new proof adduced. For all his Arguing from it depends upon his former *Complex Proposition*. That there is no other means provided by our B. Saviour, for putting us in a state of Holiness and Life, and applying the Merit of his Blood to us for obtaining the Remission of Sins, Antecedent to and Independent upon Baptism. *If there be any (says he) let it be assigned and the Controversie is ended.* These Means both outward and inward I have assigned already. I remember when this Question is objected to Heidegger a Divine of Zurich, by Austin Reding a Popish Abbot, viz. *By what means do ye hold, that the Merit of Christ is applied for Remission of Sins, unto Infants that depart before Baptism?* Heidegger (*Tumul. Concil. Trident. Tom. 1. P. 224*) Answers, *An vero putas aqua Baptismo, &c.* "But do you think, that the Merits of Christ are applied by the Baptism of Water, without the accompanying Spirit of God? If ye deny, then why may not the purifying Blood of Christ be applied unto Infants, enjoying the Privilege of the Covenant, by the Spirit of God, whose Energie is every where the Chief and Principal, and who worketh as he pleaseth.

In P. 14. He expresseth his hope of Children dying unbaptized, that they are Saved. But this as himself acknowledges, amounts to no more than a probability. And, as I hinted before, according to his Principles, I can see no ground of Probability in the case. For in his Opinion (in the close of P. 13.) such Infants are thrown upon the chance of *Extraordinary, Uncovenanted, Unnecessary and Uncertain Methods of Salvation*. And what ground there is to hope for Salvation in such *Methods* to any, I know not. I think this his Doctrine is Cruel against Infants, who may perish Eternally, for want of Baptism through no fault of their own; and Comfortless to Parents, who in his Opinion, can build no Hope of the Salvation of such Children upon the promise of the Covenant.

Our Author on the other hand, expresseth his full Assurance as to Baptized Children. "We have (says he) our B. Saviours expresse Promise to build an infallible Belief on, that, if they Die before they are guilty of Actual Sin, they are saved
" by

" by their very Baptism, washing away their Original Pollution, and applying the Merit of Christs Blood to them. I believe and hope, upon the ground of the Covenant Promise, that the Children of Christian Parents, if removed in Infancy, are saved whether Baptized or not. And if they are Baptized and preserved in Life, I shall account them in the Covenant and in a Gracious State, until they discover the contrary by a Prophane and vitious Life. For establishing his infallible belief concerning Baptized Infants: Our Author adds, " This Promise is as exprefs as words can make it, in *Mark 16. 16. He that believeth and is Baptized, shall be saved.* It is true our B. Saviour there joins Belief with Baptism. But then, " it is agreed to by our Brethren as well as by us, that the Christian Parents or Sureties profession of the Faith in name of the Children, is sufficient in Baptism.

That the Parents profession of Faith is sufficient for a Minister to administer Baptism to their Children I may grant. But it is more than I know, if Presbyterians do agree, that Parents profession of the Faith at Baptism, is sufficient unto the Salvation of their Children. How Parents make profession of the Faith in Name of their Children, and how their profession, or their real Faith, is imputed unto their Children, or how the Parents profession of the Faith, at the Baptism of their Children, performs the same thing with respect to the Salvation of these Children, that Actual Faith doth in the Adult, I do not comprehend. His Answer therefore unto the Exception he started, is at best Ambiguous: And I think his proof from the Text adduced is no less lame. For it may be further excepted, (1.) In this Text there is no exprefs mention of Baptized Children, or of their Dying before they are guilty of Actual Sin; Nor is the washing away of their Original Pollution, and the applying of the Merit of Christs Blood to them exprefsly ascribed unto their very Baptism. How then are these things as exprefs as words can make them? (2.) The Text plainly respects the Adult who actually believe and are Baptized, and therefore are saved by their own Faith, and not by the profession or Faith of any other. (3.) It evidently shews, that Baptism hath not the same degree of Necessity with Faith unto Salvation; For it is added, *He that believeth not shall be damned.* But it is not said, *He that is not Baptized shall be damned.* Clearly intimating, that it is the want of Faith, but not the want of Baptism, that inferreth Damnation. (4.) Neither is the Efficacy of Baptism in order to Salvation the same with that of believing. For Salvation is not ascribed to Baptism without Faith, but *he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* On the other hand, Damnation follows upon unbelief, for whether he be Baptized or not, *He that believeth not shall be damned.* Wherefore if it will not offend him, I shall account this proof of a Piece with his former Arguments.

CHAP. VI. *Of the Conformity of this Authors Opinion with the Popish Doctrine of Baptism.*

AFTER the publishing of this Pamphlet for the necessity of Baptism, the Author put forth a second Paper, called, *A Specimen of the Method the Presbyterians take to Answer all Arguments against their Errors*, wherein he is highly displeased, that the Doctrine he had asserted, should be called Popish. He deny's the Charge as a most injurious Calumny, and says P. 2. *The Mis-represented Author challangeth all the Presbyterian Preachers in the Kingdom. to* *reconcile*

reconcile any thing asserted by him in that Paper, with the Popish Doctrine of the necessity of Baptism to Salvation, unless they also conclude all the Texts of the New Testament relating to the Obligation of that Sacred Rite to be Popish.

I have shewed already that there is no Countenance given to his Opinion, in the Texts of the New Testament, which he adduced. And I think it will be no difficult Task to reconcile him to the Church of Rome in this Matter; If I shall evince, That his Positions are the same, with what the Papists assert against the Reformed; That he employs the same Arguments and glosses on Scripture for confirming his Opinion, which the Papists make use of for theirs; And that his Opinion is rejected, and the contrary Doctrine maintained by the Generality of all Reformed Divines in Opposition to the Errors of Rome. If these things be made good, our Author will be safe from the Thunder-bolts of the Vatican, nor can the Curses of the Council of Trent reach him in this point.

First, That his Assertions are the same with the Papists, will appear if we shall compare them together. The two chief points that our Author maintains concerning Baptism, are its Efficacy, as the means of conferring the Grace of Regeneration and Justification, and its Necessity to Salvation, which flows from the former. Now to shew, that the same Tenets are determined by the Council of Trent against the Protestants, and maintained by the Popish Doctors against Zwinglius, Calvine, Bucer, Bullinger, and other Reformed Divines, I shall place them in a paralel.

As to the Efficacy of Baptism.

Pamphlet.

THE Author of the Pamphlet P. 7. The Holy Spirit is conferred in Baptism.

P. 8. Our B. Saviour (Joh. 3. 5.) places Baptism first in order before the Spirit, plainly insinuating that he hath not only made both necessary to all that will enter into the Kingdom of God, but made it likewise the Property of Baptism to confer the Spirit.

P. 11. That that the Sacred Rite of Baptism is the only ordinary means of Remission.

P. 10. That the Spirit is conferred in Baptism, and there is no other ordinary Means of conferring him.

Papists.

SYnod. Trid. Sess. 5. Canon. 5. *Si quis per Jesu Christi Domini Nostri gratiam, quæ in Baptismate confertur, reatum Originalis peccati remitti negat, Anathema sit.*

Sess. 6. Cap. 4. *Quæ quidem Translatio [in statum gratiæ] post Evangelium promulgatum, sine lavacro Regenerationis aut ejus voto fieri non potest. Sicut Scriptum est, nisi quis renatus fuerit, &c.*

Sess. 7. De Sacramentis in genere Canon. 6. *Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam, quam significant, aut gratiam suam, non ponentibus obicem, non conferre, Anathema sit.*

Bellarmin. Tom. 3. de Sacramentis lib. 2. Cap. 2. *Afferit, Sacramenta esse veras & immediatas causas Justificationis. Et Cap.*

3. *Esse veras causas Instrumentales gratiæ.*

Bellarmin. de Baptismo. Cap. 4. *Non est sigillum ut Calvinus somniat, acceptæ gratiæ, sed est Instrumentum conferens gratiam, & signum gratiæ quæ tunc datur.*

Ibid. *Qui autem fingunt aliud Remedium præter Baptismum, apertissime pugnant cum Evangelio, Conciliis, &c.*

P. 12.

Pamphlet.

P. 12. The Children of Christian Parents are not in a Salvable Condition upon the ordinary revealed Gospel Terms of Salvation, as long as they are Unbaptized. For its necessary that they be made Christians, which they are not until they be Baptized in the Name of Christ.

Papists.

Ibid. *Tunc enim incipimus esse filii Abrahæ cum incipimus esse fideles, quod parvuli non faciunt nisi cum baptizantur, iis enim baptizari est credere. — cum incipimus esse filii Christi, id autem certum est, non fieri nisi per Baptismum.*

As to the necessity of Baptism.

Pamphlet.

PAGE 15. The Doctrine of the Non-necessity of Baptism to Salvation is a gross Error.

P. 10. Baptism Ministred in the outward Symbol, is most necessary to all who are or will be saved upon the ordinary Gospel Terms of Salvation.

P. 13. Baptism is so necessary to Salvation upon the ordinary revealed Gospel Terms, that no Unbaptized person is saved, but in an extraordinary and uncovenanted manner.

Papists.

SYNOD. Trid. Sess. 7. de Baptismo Can. 5. *Si quis dixerit Baptismum esse liberum, hoc est non necessarium ad salutem, Anathema sit.*

Bellarmin. Tom. 3. de Baptismo, Lib. 1. Cap. 4. *Nulla est Questio quin Baptismus sit necessarius ad salutem, ex Divino Christi mandato. Sed controversia est, an sit necessarius ut medium ad salutem, ita ut si quis non Baptizetur pereat, etiam si forte excusetur a Prævaricatione præcepti ob ignorantiam.*

Gregor. de Valentia Comment. Tom. 4. Disp. 4. Quest. 3. Punct. 4. *Parvulis ita Baptismus re ipsa necessarius est ad salutem, ut Secundum legem ordinariam, nequeant sine Baptismo aqua Salutem consequi, excepto unico casu. Si videlicet interficerentur pro Christo.*

So far as I can judge from this paralel, one Egg is not more like to another, than our Authors Opinion is to that of Papists. It is true in his *Specimen &c.* P. 1. he would fain perswade us that he doth not maintain the absolute necessity of Baptism, and that therefore his Doctrine is not Popish. For (says he) *The popish Doctrine is that no unbaptized Person is Saved any manner of way. But the Author of that Paper says only, That unbaptized Persons are not Saved on the ordinary Covenanted Gospel Terms of Salvation.*

But (if I may use his own Words) *he will not escape by this Distinction.* For (1.) However darkly he propose his Opinion; (after the Example of the Jesuite Gregory de Valentia, as we heard before,) he must maintain a Necessity of Baptism equivalent to an absolute Necessity, unless he can evince, that the Boundless Mercy of God doth indeed save some, on other Terms, than what are revealed and contained in the Covenant of Grace. But that any are saved in an Unrevealed and Uncovenanted manner, he hath not yet proven. (2.) When he says, the Popish Doctrine is, *That no Unbaptized Person is saved any manner of way.* I doubt much if he hath considered the Popish Doctrine in this Article. For however they plead for Baptism to be absolutely necessary to Salvation, yet they allow of some excepted Cases; as that

that Unbaptized Persons may be saved, and the Defect of Baptism supplied by the Desire or Wish of it, by Martyrdom and by true Conversion. *Synod. Trid. Sess. 6. Cap. 4. Quæ quidem Translatio [in statum gratiæ] sine Lavacro Regenerationis, aut ejus Voto, fieri non potest.* And *Bellarmin. de Baptismo, Cap. 6. Baptismus aqua suppleri potest per Martyrium.* And again, *At, sine dubio, credendum est, veram Conversionem supplere Baptismum aqua.* Now, when none of these Cases and Limitations are mentioned by our Author, he would seem to maintain a more absolute Necessity of Baptism, than the Papists do. (3.) With respect to the Adult, I observed before, *Chap. 3.* that he screws up the Efficacy and Necessity of Baptism higher than the Papists do. For, *P. 8.* he says, That *Baptism is first in Order before the Spirit, and that it is the Property of Baptism to confer the Spirit*: Whereby he makes Baptism to preceed our Regeneration or New Birth. Whereas *Bellarmino* (as we shewed) grants, That, previous to Baptism in the Adult, there is required actual Faith and Conversion unto God, which I hope our Author will not deny to be Fruits of the Spirit of Regeneration. In *P. 10.* and *11.* he thinks the Instance of *St. Paul* (recorded *Chap. 9.* and *22.* of the *Acts*, *Arise and be Baptized, and wash away thy Sins,*) is so clear a Proof of Baptism's being the only Means of Remission of Sins, that they must be unaccountably Blind and Prejudicated, who will not be convinced by it. Does not this very Instance (says he) evidently shew, that the Gospel concludes all Men under Sin, and therefore in a perishing Condition, (even tho' they do repent and forsake their Sins,) until they are washed in this Laver? But, as to this very Instance, *Bellarmino* is much more modest, in granting, that the Apostle *Paul* was, upon his Conversion and Repentance, inwardly washed from his Sins before Baptism, and that his Baptism was a Visible Sign of that Invisible Grace. *Tom. 3. de Penitentia, Lib. 2. Cap. 14. Denique & illud dici potest, debuisse Paulum, jam intus lotum invisibiliter, lavari etiam exterius visibiliter; ut non solum gratiam, sed etiam gratiæ signum haberet: Ut sensus sit eorum verborum, ablue peccata tua, i. e. Ablutionis Sacramentum accipe.*

Secondly, As our Author expresseth his Opinion in the same Positions, so he employs the same Arguments and Glosses on Scripture, which Papists use for confirming their Doctrine. His Argument from *Joh. 3. 5.* is the only Scripture Argument that *Bellarmino* adduceth for the Necessity of Baptism, *de Baptismo, Cap. 4.* But *Bellarmino* hath that, and most of all his other Arguments, *de Sacramentis in genere, Lib. 2: Cap. 3:* in his first Class of Arguments, where he alledgeth Eight Testimonies of Scripture. So our Authors 1st Proof from *Tit. 3. 5:* is in *Bellarmines 7th* Testimony. His 2^d from *Joh. 3. 5:* is in *Bellarmines 3d* Testimony. His next from *Acts 22. 16:* is in *Bellarmines 4th* Testimony. His last from *1 Pet. 3. 20:* is in *Bellarmines 8th* Testimony.

Thirdly, That it may be yet further evident, how reconcilable his Opinion is with the Popish Doctrine, I crave he may reconcile it with the common received Doctrine of Reformed Divines: And shew, either from their Confessions, or other Writings, that they attribute to Baptism a Vertue or Property of conferring the Spirit, and Remission of Sins, as the only Means thereof; Or, that they make the Divine Grace of Regeneration and Justification dependent upon Baptism, as if it were tyed to that Sacrament: Or, that they ascribe any other Vertue and Efficacy to Baptism, than what is Moral and Objective in Representing and Signing the Promises, Confirming of Faith, and Exhibiting or Applying the promised Benefits of the Covenant unto Believers, by way of a Sign and Seal, which still supposeth Grace already conferred on these, in whom this Sacrament hath its due Operation and Effect: Or, that they maintain such a Necessity of Baptism, that no Unbaptized Person is saved on the ordinary Covenanted Terms of Salvation. If Reformed

med Divines shall be cited as Witnesses in this Cause, they'll be found to give Evidence against our Authors Opinion. I shall adduce some of their Testimonies, and begin with the *Helvetian* Divines, amongst whom *Zuinglius* appeared as early in the Work of Reformation as *Luther* himself, if not before him.

Confessio Helvetica, (in *Syntagm. Confessionum*, Pag: mihi 45.) *Gratiam & res significatas, signis non ita alligari & includi, ut, &c.* And, P: 46: *Deus purgat a peccatis, &c. Obfignantur hæc omnia Baptismo.*

Zuinglius, the first and chief Instrument of the Reformation in *Zurich*, on *Matt. Cap: 23: P: 125: Signa enim externa non iustificant, ut quidam perhibent, sed Iustificationis per fidem admonent, & ad vitam innocentiam excitant. — Baptismus non facit novas homines, sed admonet nos ut tales simus, aut saltem tales evadere studeamus.*

Idem in *Joan. Cap: 3: 5: Nisi quis renatus, &c.* Per aquam autem hic non elementalem intelligit, — sed *Verbum Dei, Aquam Cælestem, i. e. Spiritus Sancti Illustrationem.*

Henry Bullinger, Successor to *Zuinglius* at *Zurich*, *Comment: in Act: 8: 37: Si credis ex toto corde licet.*] Ergo ex fide est peccatorum remissio, non per Baptismum. — Nullius enim reputamus *Mulierum & Obstetricum Baptisma*, propterea quod ex *Superfitione* administretur, & non iusto ordine, credunt enim aque beneficio *Pueris Salutem* obvenire. — Illud hoc loco adjecerim Baptismo, & in *Scripturis & in Patribus Vetusis*, tribui peccatorum remissam, ceterum per *Allæosm Sacramentariam*, qua signo tribuimus, quod revera signatus est, &c.

Idem in *1 Corinth: Cap: 7: V: 17: Quod Filii qui nascuntur ex Parente Nomen Domini invocante, Sancti & in Fœdere Dei sunt, proinde & Baptizandi.*

Peter Martyr, an *Italian* by Birth, who, after he had left *Oxford*, whither he had been called in the Reign of *Edward 6th:* was settled Professor of Divinity at *Zurich*, *Comment: ad Rom: 4: Page 124: Turc aiunt [Scolastici] Sacramenta Evangelica conferre gratiam; Atqui hoc nihil aliud est, quam Creaturis tribuere causas nostræ salutis, nosque nimium obligare Symbolis & Elementis hujus Mundi. Hoc fixum & constitutum maneat oportet, nihil Sacramentis plus concedendum esse, quod ad Salutem faciat, quam Verbo Dei.*

Ibid: ad Cap: 6: P: 220: Neque ista duo nobis sic offeruntur in Baptismo, quasi ea ante Baptismum nullo modo habeamus, Negare enim non potest Adultos, credentes Iustificationem, habere etiam antequam Baptizantur. — Neque Parvulos Baptizaremus, nijam eos ad Ecclesiam & ad Christum arbitraremur pertinere. — Obfignatur etiam nobis Jus ad Vitam Eternam. — Neque vero pars ista, Jus ad Vitam Eternam, ita accipienda est, quasi excludendi sunt e Regno Cælorum, qui non fuerint Baptizati. Si enim crediderint, & per eos non steterit, quo minus Baptizarentur, non est ambigendum de eorum Salute. Joan: 6: 47: Marc: 16: 16: Quibus verbis inuit, Baptismum non ita esse necessarium, quin Fidelis absque eo servari possit, modo ne intercedat Contemptus & Inobedientia.

That it may appear, that this Doctrine hath been hitherto retained in *Zurich*, I shall adduce one *Tigurine* Divine more. The late learned *Heidegger* handles this Subject at large, *Tumul Concil. Trid. ad Sess. Quest. 4. P. 223, &c.* And in his *Myster. Babalonis Magnæ. Tom. i. P. 184.* But I shall only cite his *Medulla Theologia Christiana, Loc: 25: Thes: 19.* “Beneficia illa Evangelii Baptismus non ut causa, virtute vel inhærente, vel assistente, efficit, sed ut sigillum obfignat. — Baptismus Unionis & Communionis cum Christo sigillum est. Impossibile autem est, ut idem simul causa rei & sigillum sit; quia illa rem præcedit, hoc sequitur. Neque plane Baptismus rem, quam obfignat, operatur ulla virtute, sive inhærente, quia nulla res corporea Spiritualem virtute inhærente operatur; sive assistente, quia Deus gratiam suam nulli Elemento resignavit. — Neque etiam Doctissimorum vi-
“ voram

“ rorum, qui Baptismum & reliqua Sacramenta cum Miraculorum signis contē-
 “ dentes, Deum ordinariæ gratiam eodem tempore, quo eam per signa represen-
 “ tant, conferre asserunt, Opinio placere potest, quia & Sacramentorum Efficaci-
 “ am in majus extollit, & Consolationem piorum minuit, & Elementorum Religionem
 “ auget, & non nihil Superstitioni pontificiæ concedit. *Thef. 26.* De Baptismi ne-
 “ cessitate sic sobrie loquendum & pie credendum est, ne vel Creaturæ accepta salus
 “ referatur, quæ soli Creatori accepta referenda est; vel ordo a Deo constitutus
 “ vel Evangelii voluntas perturbetur. — Et velle Deum etiam salvare eos, qui sine
 “ culpa sua Baptismo privantur, tum natura Baptismi, qui soli mandato Dei positi-
 “ vo innititur, nec per se ad Imaginem Dei pertinet; nec inter media salutis, sine
 “ quibus Homo non Salvatur, *Rom. 8. 29, 30.* Numeratur. — Tum Indoles omnium
 “ Ceremoniarum, quæ nullæ absolute necessariæ sunt: Tum Infantum *abansio*
 “ conditio & Privilegium, utpote qui & fœderati jam sunt, & Sancti, & promif-
 “ sionis fidei & resipiscentiæ participes esse, & Christum Redemptorem & Salvato-
 “ rem habere possunt. — Tum denique Baptismi effectus, qui non proprie Salus, sed
 “ Consolationis, lætitiæ & tranquillitatis major quidam gradus est, potenter de-
 “ monstrat.

Our Authors Opinion in all the parts of it, is so plainly contradicted in these Testimonies, that they need no Commentary.

In the next place I shall mention two of the Doctors of Divinity in *Basil*: The first *Amandus Polanus Syntag. Theologia Lib. 6. Cap. 55. P. 895.* Where he is so far from supposing that Men are not Christians until they be Baptized, that he makes an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, the ground of Baptism. *Soli illi Baptizandi sunt, qui in fœdere gratiæ censentur.* — *Aqua ablumitur etiam infideles, sed Sanguine & Spiritu Christi, tantum fideles.* Ergo non omnes qui Baptizantur accipiunt Remissionem Peccatorum & Regenerantur, sed tantum credentes. He placeth the Efficacy of Baptism in Signifying and Sealing. *Fines Baptismi, 1. ut Nobis sit obsignatio susceptionis in fœdus gratiæ, — 2. Ut per abluitionem externam significet seu representet, Confirmet, & prebeat Sacramentaliter internam Mundationem animarum.* And as to the necessity of Baptism, *P. 897.* *Infantibus necessarius est Baptismus non simpliciter ad invisibilem, sed secundum quid, ad visibilem inscriptionem ipsorum in Christum & corpus Ecclesiæ, &c.* *Vid. Lib. 6. Cap. 49.*

The Second is Doctor *John Wollebius Compend. Theol. Christianæ, Lib. 1. Cap. 22. Thef. 21.* *Effecta Sacramentorum non sunt Justificatio aut Sanctificatio, tanquam ex opere operato: Sed utriusque beneficii confirmatio & obsignatio.* — *Loca autem Scrip. quibus de Sacramentis talia prædicantur, ut supra ostensum est, per Sacramentalem metonymiam sunt exponenda.* *Ibid. Cap. 23. Thef. 20.* *Necessarius est Baptismus non absolute, sed ex Christi præcepto: Nec talis fingi potest necessitas, propter quam Infantes aut ab alio quam a Ministro Baptismari, aut si sine Baptismo decedant, beatorum numero excludi debeant.*

Unto these Doctors of *Basil*, I shall add two Eminent Divines of *Bern*: *Walsaugus Musculus Loc. Com. P. 284.* Confutes our Authors Opinion of Baptism's being the only Means of the Remission of Sins, and of applying the Merit of Christs Blood for that effect, as the false Doctrine of the Popish School-Men. *Nullis tamen Scripturis probant, Sacramenta medium esse per quod confertur Peccatorum Remissio.* Nos vero Simpliciter medium conferendi illam, dicimus esse verbum gratiæ per quod Remissio annuntiatur, sive id fiat in genere ac publice, sive specialiter ac privatim. Videtur quidem Remissio Peccatorum tribui Baptismati, *Acts 2. 38. & 22. 16.* Verum distinguendum est inter realem gratiæ hujus & Sacramentalem Collationem. Realis est, quæ per internam gratiam, Sacramentalis, quæ signo externo confertur.

Ibid. P. 329. He maintains, that Regeneration and the other benefits sealed in Baptism.

Baptism are not always conferred in that very moment wherein Baptism is Administered. *Perficiuntur autem ista, pro voluntate Spiritus Christi, aut ante, aut post Baptismum, vel in ipso Baptizandi actu, ne quis spiritum externo sic putet alligatum esse Sacramento, ut hanc invisibilem Regenerationis, Ablutionis, Initiationis, Sanctificationis & Obsequiationis Gratiā, vel in quorumvis Baptizatorum cordibus, vel semper in ipso actu Baptismi, Spiritualiter & efficaciter operetur.* And of the Necessity of Baptism he says P. 335. *Et hanc ob causam non nulli patres, equorum numero est & Augustinus, Infantes sine Baptismo ex hac vita abreptos Condemnationi subjecerunt, quasi nulla ratione nisi solius Baptismatis Gratiā Christi participes esse queant Infantes. — Verum id admodum ουλνεον & inconueniens gratiā Christi; quod Baptismate quouis modo privari perinde haberent atque gratiā ipsa privari.*

And Benedictus Aretius is so far from owning our Authors Opinion, in attributing unto Baptism the Vertue and Property of conferring the Spirit and Remission of Sins; that, on the contrary, he affirms, there is no necessary Connexion betwixt the Divine Grace and the Outward Symbols. *Com: in Acta Apost: Cap: 10: V: 24: Sic Baptismus institutus est à Christo, interim huic non sunt alligata dona spiritualia necessaria sequela: Sed dantur interdum ante Baptismum, alias in Baptismo, alias post Baptismum, quandoque nunquam, ut impii baptizantur quidem, sed dona gratiā diuinā non sentiunt. Interim maximum habet usum Baptismus, nam confirmat & obsequiat Iustificatos jam prius: Deinde Ecclesia externa incorporat, &c. V: 47: — Docet signis non alligari Dei gratiā necessario, quin sine his sua largiatur dona. — Confutantur hic qui signis gratiā alligant. Idem in Marc: Cap: 1: Ego baptizari vos aqua, &c. Hic distinguit inter Ministerium externum, & Dona interna, quod illa non connexa sint necessitate aliqua. Caterum, quod alibi Apostolus Baptismum vocat Lavacrum Regenerationis, &c. non eo facit ut Ministri ex se quicquam possint, aut ulla sit necessaria copula inter Ministerium & Dona interna; sed organa esse per quā Deus operetur secundum beneplacitum. — Itaque reipsa unus & idem est Baptismus [Joannis & Christi] forma tamen duplex est: Externus enim alius est, qui solum impiis contingit: Alius Internus, qui cum Externo, aut sine eo, etiam bonis confertur.*

Whereas our Author denies the Children of Believers to be Christians, or in a Salvable Condition, before they be Baptized: Aretius owns them to be Heirs of the Kingdom, and makes their Interest in Christ the Ground of Administering Baptism unto them. *Com: in Mar: Cap: 49: P: 170: Infantes ad Christum pertinent, & ipse ad eos: Ergo ad Infantes pertinet etiam Christianismi Tessera, quæ est Baptismus. — Vita Aeterna, quæ est ultimum bonum, Infantibus neganda non est: Ergo, &c.*

The same Doctrine was received with the Reformation, and retained ever since in the Church of Geneva. The Judgment of the great Calvin will not be questioned in this Matter, having so plainly declared it in several of his Writings. See his *Antidot: ad Concil: Trid: Sess: 6:* and on *Joh: 3: 5:* and elsewhere. I shall only adduce a Passage or two out of his *Institutiones*, which are incompatible with our Authors Opinion. *Institut: Lib: 4: Cap: 15: § 20: Quantum damni iniecerit dogma illud male expositum, Baptisma esse de necessitate salutis, pauci animadvertunt, — § 22: Sed hanc controversiam [scil: de Baptismo à privatis ministrato] mox nullo negotio dirimet hoc principium: Non arceri à Regno Cælorum Infantes, quos è presenti vita migrare continget antequam aqua mergi datum fuerit. Atqui jam visum est, fieri non debem injuriam Dei Fæderi, nisi in eo acquiescimus, ac si per se infirmum esset, quum ejus effectus neque à Baptismo neque ab ullis accessionibus pendeat. Accedit postea Sacramentum Signi instar, non quod Efficaciam Dei Promissioni; quasi se invalidè conferat, sed eam duntaxat nobis confirmet. Unde sequitur non ideo baptizari Fidei Liberos, ut Filii Dei tunc primum fiant, qui ante alieni fuerint ab Ecclesia, sed solenni potius signo ideo recipi in Ecclesiam, quia promissionis beneficio jam ante ad Christi Corpus pertinebant,*

The Venerable and Learned *Theodore Beza* defends the same as the Doctrine of that Church; *Tract. Theol. de Cœna Domini contra Joachimum Westphalum*, P. 255.

“ Interea nostram Salutem, à Baptismi Sacramento pendere non putamus, sed à nostra Adoptione, ex Formula Fœderis, erò Deus tuus & Seminis tui. — Opinionem prorsus falsum arbitramur, de absoluta Baptismi necessitate ad Salutem: Quum è contrario prius oporteat Adoptatum esse à Deo, quam aliquis ritè baptizari possit. Ibid: Absterfio Calumniarum *Tilemanni Helhusii*, P. 333: “ Dicimus enim oportere nos in Fœdere comprehendì, ac proinde ad Christum pertinere, priusquam baptizemur: Neque gratiam Adoptionis à Baptismo inchoamus, sed per eum potius dicimus illam in nobis obfignari: Sic jubetur *Paulus* Baptismo abluerè peccata sua, quorum tamen veniam jam erat consecutus. — Neque enim Baptismi efficaciam ad illud temporis momentum restringimus quo exhibetur, sed illum pro bona Dei voluntate scimus fructum bonum edere. — Quod de casu necessitatis refert, vix dignum putarem refutatione, nisi error ille nimium esset inveteratus. — Sed absit ut à Cœlo arceamus, qui nulla sua culpa, prius ad Dominum migrant, quam baptizari potuerint, quum alioqui ad Dei Fœdus pertineant, &c.

Frederic-Spanheim P. while at *Geneve*, taught also the same Doctrine, *Syntag. Disp. de Baptismo*, P. 352: “ Necessitas non absoluta nec medii, sed hypothetica & præcepti tantum, — adeo ut non privatio, sed contèptus damnet. P. 353: “ Explodimus — 1: Qui satagunt Baptismum & Baptizatis omnibus conferre gratiam, & ex opere operato, non obstante, Nim. obice peccati mortalis. 2. Qui rem Baptismi signo vel includunt, vel affingunt. 3. Qui Baptismum absolute necessari-um arbitrantur.

Francis Turretin, a late Divine of *Geneve*, hath largely treated on this Subject. I shall only cite some few Passages, that are plainly contradictory to our Authors Opinion, *Theol. Elenct. Loc. 19: Quest. 8: de Efficacia Sacramentorum, Thes. 8: Sacramenta non possunt operari, nec insita sibi vi conferre, quod secundum institutionem Dei in subjecto præsupponunt aut præ-exigunt, qualis est gratia Justificationis & Regenerationis*. Here he makes the New Birth and Remission of Sins antecedent to the Sacraments: And he maintains against the Papists, that the simple Privation of Baptism doth not infer the Guilt of Eternal Punishment, and Exclusion from the Kingdom of Heaven. Ibid: *Loc. 19: Quest. 12: Thes. 6: Primo, Quia sine Baptismo non pauci servantur, & cum Baptismo plures pereunt. Thes. 7: Secundo, Si daretur absoluta Baptismi necessitas, Dei gratia alligata esset Sacramentis. Thes. 10: Quinto, Quia illi ad quos pertinet res significata Baptismi, Nim. Promissiones Dei ante Baptismum, non possunt excludi à Regno Cœlorum propter Privationem Signi. At ad Infantes Fidelium pertinent Promissiones ex Act. 2: 38: Ergo.*

We may now consult some of the *Germane* Divines. I shall begin with *Martin Bucer*, whose Fame, for Learning and Zeal in the Work of Reformation, procured him a Call from *Strasbourg* to the Profession of Divinity in *Cambridge*. *Comm. in Joan. Cap. 3: V. 5: “ Per Aquam hic libenter Baptismum cum Chrysostomo intelligo: Non quod externa Lotio per se necessaria sit ad Salutem. — Mos Scripturæ est, ut Symbolis tribuat, quæ Symbolis representantur & exhibentur. Hinc Ananias dicebat Paulo, surge, baptizare & ablue peccata tua, Act. 22: 16. Quum jam ante à peccatis esset inde purgatus. — Proinde quod Christus hic dixit, nisi quis renatus fuerit, ex Aqua & Spiritu, &c. Sic intelligo, nisi quis Ablutionem Peccatorum verumque Spiritum percipiat, & ita in meum Gregem recipiatur, quod ordinavi Baptismo fieri, non poterit Deum vere cognoscere, & Justitiæ ejus, Gaudii & Pacis in Spiritu Sancto, in quibus Regnum Dei situm est, fieri particeps; id enim est ingredi in Regnum Dei. Neque vero ex hac expositione sequitur, Aquæ Baptismum ad Salutem per se necessarium esse, adeo ut nemo sine eo salvari possit,*

“ contra id quod Dominus dixit, *Marci* ultimo, Qui non crediderit condemnabitur, omittens Baptismum : Quum antea dixisset, Qui crediderit & baptizatus fuerit, salvabitur. Dominus enim spectavit hic quod habet publicum institutum suum, quod nemo piorum volens præteribit : Aquæ vero his non plus Salutem affixit, quam *Paulus & Petrus*, dum per Lavacrum Aquæ nos salvos factos, affirmant. A Spiritu est tota Regeneratio, eum qui habuerit, etiam si Aquæ Baptismum non perceperit, nova nihilominus in Domino Creatura est & Civis Regni Dei ; Unde & hic Dominus in sequentibus tantum de Spiritu, omiſſa Aqua, verba facit. *Vid.* etiam in *Matt. Cap. 3: V. 10.*

Zacharias Ursinus, Author of the famous Catechism of *Heidelberg*, and Professor of Divinity in that University. *Scholasticarum Exercitationum*, Lib. 2. Theſ. Theol. de Sacramentis, Theſ. 16. “ Differunt a verbo Sacramenta, quod illud sermone, hæc gestibus significant Dei erga nos voluntatem. Illo fides & inchoatur & confirmatur, his confirmatur tantum inchoata. Illud etiam sine Sacramentis docet & confirmat, hæc autem non sine verbo, sine illius cognitione adulti non servantur, sine Sacramentorum usu autem, si ex contemptu omiſſus non fuerit, & renasci homines & servari possunt. Illud etiam incredulis & impiis predicandum est, ad hæc eos tantum admittere debet Ecclesia, quos Deus pro membris Ecclesiæ nos habere jubet.

De Baptismo, Theſ. 17. “ Neque autem omnes, qui Baptizantur aqua, sive Infantes, sive adulti, gratiæ Christi fiunt participes, Libera enim est Æterna Dei Electio, & ad Regnum Dei vocatio.

Theſ. 18. “ Neq; etiam quicumq; non Baptizantur aqua, a gratia Christi excluduntur, non enim privatio, sed contemptus Baptismi, ex fœdere Dei cum fidelibus & eorum liberis inito, excludit.

Hieronymus Zanchius, an Italian by Birth, was also professor of Divinity at *Heidelberg*, whose Judicious and Learned Works do still praise him in the Churches. He hath written a large Treatise of Baptism. I shall only excerpt a few of the many things he hath to the present purpose. Comm. in Epist. ad Eph. Digressione de Baptismo Cap. 3. § 19. “ Cæterum multos etiam sine Baptismo aquæ, (modo absit contemptus, & omnis negligentia) servatos fuisse, servarique posse extra Controversiam est apud eruditos & pios viros. Cap. 6. de necessitate Baptismi, §. 5. “ Necessarius est Infanti ad hoc, ut visibili institutione inseratur in Christum & in Corpus Ecclesiæ : Non autem simpliciter ad salutem, Invisibilemque Incorporationem : Quasi sine lavacro aquæ Christi Membrum esse non possit, & servari. §. 6. Hoc supra demonstratum est inde, quia filii nostri sunt in fœdere, non minus quam erant filii Israelitarum, atq; illi etiam sine Circumcisione servabantur, ut quando moriebantur ante Octavum diem. Ergo neq; nostri propterea damnandi sunt, quia cum non potuerint Baptizari, moriuntur sine Baptismo aquæ.

David Pareus, a Doctor of *Heidelberg*, who employed his Labours in searching and interpreting the Holy Scriptures. In his *Adversaria* in *Joh. 3. 5.* “ Aqua & Spiritus idem sunt, sicut ignis & Spiritus. — *Augustinus* & plerique patres de Baptismo aquæ intellexerunt ; sed, salva ipsorum Authoritate, dissentio : Alioqui enim sequeretur privationem Baptismi aquæ damnare, cum tamen Christus non dixerit, qui non Baptizatus fuerit, sed tantum, qui non crediderit, damnabitur. — Obiectio. Nisi quis ex aqua & Spiritu fuerit genitus, &c. Ergo recte Papistæ, Baptismum absolute esse necessarium ad salutem, & ubiquitarii hodiæ : Ante Baptismum Infantes non esse in fœdere, Spiritum alligatum esse aquæ : Aquam & Spiritum Sanctum eundem pariter habere effectum. Resp. Negatur antecedens loqui de Baptismo. Probat 1. Quia Spiritus & aqua sunt æquipollentia, ut patet ex ver. 6. & 8. &c.

Adversaria in Tit. 3. 5. "Per lavacrum Regenerationis] — Locutio metonymica : Tribuitur enim signo res signata, — Baptismus est lavacrum Regenerationis, *h. e.* efficax sigillum ejus. — Regenerationis effector est Spiritus S. non ergo aqua. — Omnium Sacramentorum usus & finis est significare & obsignare gratiam, *Rom.* 4. Ergo non ipsa conferunt. — Latro servatus sine Baptismo, Martyres eodem modo. *Schmidlinus* ergo falsissimi contendit, Baptismum proprie esse lavacrum Regenerationis, Regenerationis vim affixam annexamq; esse aquæ ut sine Baptismo aquæ Regenerentur & servantur nulli.

Unto these Doctors of *Heidelberg*, I shall add a late Divine of no small Name both for Solidity and Moderation, I mean *Johannes Ludovicus Fabricius*. *Oper. P.* 199. de Baptismo per Hominem privatum. "Cum enim non privatio, sed contemptus Sacramentorum damnet, si maxime ob absentiam Ministri Ecclesiæ, Infans Baptismum recipere non posset, palam est, id æternæ ipsius saluti minime obstare. *P.* 172. Fundamentum cur Infantuli Baptizandi sunt, omnes hoc ponunt, Quia in foedere sunt.

The same Doctrine is taught by *M. Wendelin* professor of Divinity in the School of *Anhalt*. *Compend. Theol. lib. 1. Cap. 22. Thes. 14.* "Non omnes Infantes in ipso Baptismi externi actu, & per hanc cæremoniam externam fide in Christum donantur & regenerantur. This he proves by seven Arguments and Answers the Popish Objections. *Thes. 16.* Ita tamen ex hypothese voluntatis divinæ necessarius est Baptismus, ut non privatio, sed contemptus ejus nocere possit. — Contemptus autem hic non cadit in Infantes, qui uti ratione nondum possunt; Nec in adultos eos, — Qui expetunt, Itaq; nec illi nec hi damnandi, si absq; Baptismo eterno decedant.

Jo: Piscator Professor of Divinity at *Herborn* is of the same Judgment, *Comm. in Marc. 16. 16.* — Et Baptizatus fuerit] Si scil. copiam Baptismi habuerit. *Secus enim non ita præcise Baptismum ad salutem esse necessarium : Patet ex sententia sequenti huic opposita, ubi Baptismus omittitur. Si autem Baptismus aque ac fides ad salutem requireretur, dicendum fuisset in antithesi, qui vero non crediderit, aut non fuerit Baptizatus condemnabitur. Hinc illud axioma in Ecclesia receptum : Non privatio Baptismi, sed contemptus, damnat. Idem, in Act. 2. 38. In Remissionem Peccatorum] id est in Testimonium Remissionis Peccatorum ut habeatis, Scil. Testimonium Divinum, quod Deus vobis remiserit peccata vestra, propter Jesum Christum in quem Creditis. Metonymia subjecti. Non autem ad consequendum Remissionem Peccatorum per hoc medium sive Instrumentum : Quia sola fides medium illud sive Instrumentum est quo Remissionem Peccatorum in Evangelio apprehendimus.*

If we shall take a Specimen of the Dutch Divines, we'll find the same Doctrine taught in all the famous Universities in the United Netherlands. For *Seiden* there needs no more Authentick Testimony, than that *Synopsis Purioris Theologia*, composed and harmoniously agreed upon by four Celebrated Doctors in that University, *Poliander, Rivet, Walans, and Thyssus*. *Synops. Purior. Theol. Disp. 43. Praside Andrea Riveto. Thes. 30. Finis Sacramentorum proprius est, ut obsignet fidelibus promissionem Evangelii, & fidem confirmet. — Thes. 38. Atqui ut talis Sacramentorum necessitas non est ponenda, quæ ipsis Dei gratiam alliget, aut aqua absolute pendeat hominum salus : Cavendum est tamen, ne in defectu peccantes ea ut inutilia negligamus. Coral. 2. 3. Nulla Sacramenta sunt absolute ad salutem necessaria. Nulla etiam sunt ex hypothese præcepti Divini, ita necessaria, necessitate medii, ut si contemptus absuerit, & impossibilitas privationis causa fuerit, possit aut debeat a participatione salutis arceri, qui visibili Elemento non potuit uti.*

Ibid. Disp. 44. Praside Antonio Walao Thes. 26. Rejicimus ergo primum Sententiam Pontificiorum, qui externa hæc signa gratiam conferre volunt ex opere, ut loquantur operato, &c. Thes. 27. Rejicimus etiam Sententiam quorundam ubi-

“ quitariorum, qui vim Regeneratricem Spiritus Sancti, ita aquæ externæ in Baptismo alligant, ut vel ea ipsi aquæ insit, vel saltem non nisi in ipso Baptismi actu Regenerationem inchoet: pugnat hoc enim cum omnibus Scripturæ locis, in quibus fides & resipiscencia, ac proinde & Regenerationis initium ac semen in Baptizandis præ-exigitur.

Passing *Hoornbeek* and others of the Professors of *Leiden*, I shall only mention one Doctor of great Renown in the Learned World, both for Divinity and Ecclesiastick History, the lately deceased *Friderick Spanhenim* F. Operum Tom. 3. Pt. 2. Elench. Controvers. P. 764. Having exhibited the Popish Opinion concerning the Necessity of Baptism, he gives these as the Grounds of their Error, which equally strick against our Authors Doctrine, *De alligata Baptismo gratia interna Regenerationis, Item de pari necessitate ablutionis externæ atque internæ per Spiritum Sanctum.*

The same Divinity hath been still taught in the University of *Utrecht*, *Andreas Essenius* Compend. Theol. Cap. 18. Thes. 20. “ Gratia Spiritualis ad recte ordinatum hujus Sacramenti usum præsupponitur: Atq; ita Statuendum saltem judicio Charitatis. Sic de Baptismo diserte Marc. 16. 16. Fides ergo natura prior est. *Alt.* 2. 39. Ad liberos fidelium, etiam ante eorum Baptismum, extenditur promissio. Thes. 33. Non tamen agnoscimus absolutam necessitatem medii in Baptismo, ac si qualiscunq; ejus privatio hominem necessario dampnaret. Nam 1. Gratia salutaris per Baptismum non confertur; sed adeum præsupponitur, & per eum obsignatur, &c.

Melchior Leydecker Synopsis. Theol. Christian. Lib. 6. Cap. 5. Thes. 25. “ Non tamen agnoscenda est absoluta necessitas medii in Baptismo cum pontificiis errantibus ex hypothesi de Baptismi causalitate. Nam gratia salutaris per Baptismum non confertur; sed præsupponitur potius & per eum obsignatur.

Petrus van Mastricht Theol. Theoretico-Pract. Lib. 7. Cap. 4. §. 23. “ Queritur an Baptismus ad salutem sit absolute necessarius? — Reformati necessitatem tum præcepti Divini, tum egregiæ utilitatis, agnoscunt contra Socinianos, sed absolutam, contra Pontificios & Lutheranos negant. Eo quod, — Pro natura Sacramentorum omnium, Baptismus, fœdus gratiæ, Regenerationem & Remissionem Peccatorum obsignans; gratiam Salutarem Obsignandum præsupponat. — Obijciunt nihilominus locum *Joan.* 3. 5. Resp. Locum illum non agere de Baptismo Christi.

Hermanus Witsius (now at *Leiden*) while Professor of Divinity at *Utrecht*, wrote a most accurate Dissertation upon this whole Subject, which may be seen in his *Miscellanea Sacra*, Tom. 2. Exercit. 19. de Efficacia Baptismi. I shall spare the citing of any part of *Witsius* his *Exercitation*, seeing therein our Author may find his whole Opinion learnedly and solidly confuted: And particularly his main Proposition, that it is the Property of Baptism to confer the Spirit, and that the Grace of Regeneration and Remission of Sins are ordinarily conferred in Baptism, and not before it, which Opinion *Witsius* demonstrates to be destitute of all Ground in Holy Scripture.

Our Authors Doctrine is also condemned, as *Popish*, by the Doctors in the University of *Groning*. I shall begin with *Francis Gomar* the great Antagonist of *Arminius*, while Collegue with him at *Leiden*, *Disput. Theolog. Disp. 33. de Baptismi S. Scripturæ, & Ecclesiæ Romanæ, repugnantia.* Thes. 12. “ Contra vero Ecclesiæ Romana apostatica finem Baptismi esse Regenerationis & Justificationis Inchoationem & Perfectionem statuit. Sicut ait *Bellarminus*, *Finis principalis secundum Catholicos, imo secundum Scripturas, est Justificare & Regenerare.* Thes. 13. Quinta repugnantia in effectis, conspicua est. Sacra enim Scriptura docet, effectum illius esse, Inchoatæ Regenerationis, & Gratia Justificationis Significationem & Confirmationem.

tionem. — *Thef.* 14: Contra vero Ecclesia Romana apostatica, Regenerationis & Justificationis gratiam Baptismi opere, primum inchoari & simul perfici; sive non solum Peccata omnia remitti, sed etiam Fidei, Spei, Charitatis, Habitus Infundi. — *Thef.* 18: Contra vero Romana Ecclesia apostatica Baptizandos omnes, tam Adultos quam Infantes, Christi & Regenerationis ac Justificationis omnino expertes; tradit: Ideoque si, absque Baptismo, vel Voto illius, aut Martyrio, moriantur, Infantes quidem Visionis Dei absentia, Adultos vero, præterea cruciatibus æternis damnandos.

Henr. *Altingius*, who was of good Repute at Heidelberg before he was called to Groning, is of the same Mind. *Loc. Com.* 2: de Sacram: P: 294: *Quæst.* Sitne Aqua Baptismus ad Salutem simpliciter necessarius? — Nos negamus. *Ratio*, 1: Nullum Sacramentum ad Salutem est simpliciter necessarium. — *Probat.* Quod Gratiam Salutis non operatur, aut confert insita sibi vi, sed tantum eam declarat & obfignat, id ad Salutem simpliciter necessarium non est. Nullum Sacramentum gratiam Salutis operatur aut confert insita sibi vi, prout supra ostensum. Ergo. P: 295, 296: Ad Pontificiorum Objectionem, Quod Baptismus Aquæ sit necessarius ex dicto Christi, Joan: 3: 5: Nisi quis rege[n]itus fuerit ex Aqua, &c. Resp: Baptismum non intelligi, verum Spiritus Sancti Regenerantis Virtutem, &c.

I shall add only a Third of no less Esteem than the former, *Samuel Marcius*, *Colleg. Theol.* *Loc. ult.* *Thef.* 57, 58: Baptismi necessitas, quam quidem agnoscimus conditionalem & præcepti, — non tamen absolutam & medii, ut volunt Pontificii, — Dictum Christi, Joan: 3: 5: Non est de Baptismo, sed de Regeneratione Spirituali expressa per *Hendriæm* nomine Aqua Spiritualis & Spiritus Aquæ. — Neque debet esse major ipsius Necessitas quam Circumcisionis, cujus non Privatio damnabat, sed Contemptus. — Nec Dei gratia Sacramentis est alligata, aut possunt illi [Infantes] arceri à Regno Cælorum propter Sacramenti defectum, quibus nec Sacramentum fuisset conferendum, nisi jus habuissent ex Conditione Fœderis ad Regnum Cælorum.

Let us hear also some Divines of the University of Franeker. *Joan.* *Maccovius*, *Loc. Com.* de Baptismo, P: 367: Baptismus non est necessarius absolute, sed ex Hypothese Mandati Divini. Nempe hic valet regula illa Bernardi, Non Privatio sed Contemptus Sacramenti damnat. — Non semper idem homo eodem temporis momento & Aqua & Spiritu Baptizatur. — Interdum Baptismus Aquæ est sine Baptismo Spiritus, ut docet exemplum Simonis Magi, Act: 8: 13: Interdum confertur prius Spiritus S. & post Baptismus Aquæ, ut Act: 8: 12, 37, 38: Interdum subsequitur Baptismus Spiritus, ut in Infantibus.

Doctor Ames Medul. *Theol.* *Lib.* 1: *Cap.* 40: *Thef.* 4: de Baptismo & Cæna Domini. Tam absolute tamen necessaria non sunt ad Salutem, ut eorum Absentia vel Privatio mera Privationem inferat hujus: Neque debent eo nomine, vel à non ministris legitimis, vel extra Ecclesiasticum Cœtum celebrari. *Vid.* *Ames.* *Bellarmin.* *Enervat.* *Tom.* 3: *Lib.* 1.

Nicolaus Arnoldus condemns our Authors Opinion, as opposit to the Orthodox Doctrine of the Reformed Churches. *Lux in Tenebris*, on Job: 3: 5: to the Popish Inference of the absolute Necessity of Baptism, He Answers, *Bisariam* hic nostri Theologi respondent. Quidam, non agi hic de Sacramento Baptismi. — Votem Aqua dicunt esse Exegeticam Spiritus. — Alii tamen ex nostratibus largiuntur, age hisce verbis, de Baptismo Aqua etiam: Sed negant Consequentiam, &c. On Acts 8: 21: He inferreth as the Doctrine of the Orthodox, Baptismum non conferre Regenerationis gratiam. Quia Simon Magus baptizatus non habuit partem in negotio Salutis. On Rom: 6: 2: *Luther.* Baptismum esse ordinarium medium Regenerationis consequenda, Quia qui baptizantur, in mortem Christi baptizantur. *Arnold* Answers, Non agi de Baptismi Efficacia & Virtute, sed de Baptizatorum Officio.

As this is the Divinity of their Schools, so the Reformed Churches in the Nether-

lands never entertained our Authors Opinion, of their Childrens being no Christians, nor in a Salvable Condition, while Unbaptized. On the contrary in their *Liturgy*, at the Administration of Baptism, the Parents are required to declare, that they own their Children to be Sanctified in Christ, and that therefore, as Members of his Church, they ought to be Baptism. "Hoewel ouse kinderen in souden ont-
 "fangen ende gheboren Zijn, ende daerom allerhande elendigheyt, ja de verdoe-
 "menisse selve onderworpen, of gy niet bekent datse in Christo geheylicht Zijn,
 "ende daerom als Lidmaten Sijner gemeynte behooven gedoopt te welen? Ant-
 "woorde: Ja wy.

The current Doctrine of the Reformed Church in *France* is no less opposit to our Authors Sentiments. I shall mention a few of their most eminent Divines. *Lambertus Danaus* Professor of Divinity at *Ortez*. in *Augustini Enchiridion*, Cap: 42.

"Baptismus igitur est Sacramentum Novæ Vitæ & Salutis Æternæ. — Obsignari
 "enim Baptismo horum Dei donorum fructum, in nobis fidelibus certum est, non
 "autem conferri ea per Baptismum. In Cap: 119: Tantum abest ut pia & erudita
 "vetustas Pædobaptismum damnaverit, ut contra in eo commendando fuerint nimii
 "Patres propter Errorem Pelagianorum, & dum vitarunt eorum vitium, incide-
 "runt ipsi in contrarium, imprudenti quodam Æstu Disputationis abrepti, adeo ut
 "dicerent, ne Parvulos quidem & Infantes salvos fieri posse nisi baptizarentur.

Daniel Chamier Professor in *Montauban*, Panstrat. De Sacram. Lib. 5. Cap. 9. §. 9. &c. "Ad Argumentum Papistarum pro Baptismi necessitate ex *Joan*. 3. 5. Respon-
 "deo, non posse dari loquutum Christum de Baptismo in aqua: i. e. aquam eo loco
 "nominatam proprio literalique sensu, pro externo & corporali Elemento Baptismi.
 And largely vindicates *Calvins* Interpretation from the Objections of *Bellarmin*: §. 54.
 "Ad Argu: Quod Baptismus sit medium a Christo institutum, quo liberamur a pec-
 "cato originali: Resp. — Etenim Baptismus neque solum neque præcipuum est
 "remedium, sed duntaxat, Sacramentale, i. e. Externum, ac proinde non absolute
 "necessarium, cujus absentia non aufert necessario gratiam Dei; in qua verum
 "est & Proprium & Universale remedium. Ibid. Cap. 10. §. 14. 15. &c. Si constat
 "omnibus his partibus Argum. Si enim detur sine Baptismo gratia efficax; ergo
 "potest quis salutem consequi absq; Baptismo. — Sed certe si ad nullos Infantes
 "gratia pertingat absque Baptismo, nulli ergo Infantes absque Baptismo pertinent
 "ad foedus Divinum. At hoc falsum.

The same Divinity was taught in the University of *Saumur*, as may be seen in the *Theses Salurienses*, *Disp: de Sacramentis*, where *Moses Amyrald* maintains the Efficacy of Sacraments to be only Objective and Moral, requiring a Faculty endowed with the Exercise of Knowledge for their Operation. And, *Disp: de necessitate Baptismi*, He impugns the Popish Doctrine, and answers our Authors chief Argument, from *Joh*: 3: 5.

We find the like in *Sedan*, *Thes: Sedanens*, Vol: 1: *Disp: de necessitate Baptismi*, *Præfide Molineo*, § 2: "At si quis Baptismum non percepit, vel quia Baptizans de-
 "fuit, vel quia obstitit Persecutorum Violentia, vel quia id factum est per Parentum
 "incuriam, non putamus eum excidisse Salute, aut exclusum esse Regno Cælorum.
 Which he proves at large.

It is true *Le Blanc* and *Jurieu* do in some Points agree with our Authors Opini-
 on, but they are sufficiently confuted by their own Countrey-Man. *Elie Saurin*, in
 his *Examen de la Theologie de Monsieur Jurieu*.

I shall add one Testimony of the Judgment of the whole Reformed Churches of
France in this Matter, which is contained in two *Memorials* given in by their Depu-
 ties in their Name, upon the Kings Declaration, February 20: 1680: discharging any
 to employ Midwives or Chirurgeons of the Reformed Religion. In the first, hav-
 ing

ing declared that the Reformed cannot in Conscience suffer the Popish Midwives to Baptize their Children, they give this ground of it. " Leur creance n'étant pas que le Batême soit d'une nécessité absolue pour le salut des enfans, quand la mort previent les soins & la diligence de ceux qui le doivent procurer ; ni qu'en nul cas les personnes laïques puissent administrer le Batême ou l'ondoyement, ni que fait l'ondoyement par des personnes laïques puisse tenir lieu d'un véritable & legitime Batême.

In the other they have these Words, " Et le fondement sur lequel les Catholique s'appuyent pour s'eloigner de la pratique de la primitive Eglise, qui est la nécessité absolue du Batême, étoit encore inconnu à l'antiquité ; car dans le quatrième siècle on ne Baptisoit qu'à pâques & à la Pentecôte. On y différoit même souvent le Batême jusqu'à la mort, comme l'histoire du Grand Constantin & celle de ses enfans le justifie. Ce qui ne seroit pas arrivé si l'on y avoit crû le Batême absolument nécessaire. — Ce qui fait voir qu'il [St. Ambrose] étoit du même Sentiment que ceux de la R. P. R. qui croient que ce n'est pas proprement la privation du Batême, mais le mépris que l'on en fait, qui est prejudiciable aux hommes : Et que Dieu y peut suppléer, & y suppléer souvent de l'abondance de sa grace. See for these Memorials, *La vie de pierre du Bosc* P. 308. 311.

If the Testimonies of Foreign Churches shall perhaps be of small value with a Scots Episcopal Clergyman, he may at least be desired to reconcile his Opinion with the Doctrine of the Church of England. The Articles of that Church published in *Ann.* 1552. and afterwards in *Ann.* 1562, do noway favour our Author. The 27 Article of Baptism, runs thus, " Baptism is not only a sign of Profession and mark of Difference whereby Christian Men are discerned from others that be not Christened : But it is also a sign of Regeneration or New-Birth, whereby as by an Instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church : The promises of the Forgiveness of Sin, of our Adoption to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed ; Faith is Confirmed, and Grace encreased by vertue of Prayer unto God. Here is not one word of our Authors Necessity of Baptism to Salvation as the only means of Remission, or of the Priority of Baptism to the Spirit, or of its being the Property of Baptism to confer the Spirit. But on the contrary, all the Efficacy that is ascribed to Baptism, is placed in signifying and visible sealing, which plainly supposeth a prior Right to the Promises and Benefits that are so sealed. And the confirming of Faith and encreasing of Grace clearly presuppose these Fruits of the Spirit in the person to be Baptized.

For further Illustration of the Judgment of the Church of England in this Matter, I shall mention some of her most eminent Divines, who can neither be suspected of ignorance, nor charged with receding from the sound Doctrine of their Mother Church, seeing their Zeal for, and learned Labours in Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine, hath rendred their Names Illustrious through all the Reformed World.

The famous Dr. Whitaker professor of Divinity at Cambridge, refutes our Authors Doctrine as Popish, *Oper. Tom. 1. Defensio contra Joan. Duræum Scorum Jesuitam*, P. 195. " Neque enim ita cujusquam salus pendet de Baptismo, ut qui ante morietur, quam ad Baptismum pervenerit, spem salutis amiserit. Hanc opinionem ut impiam & inhumanam explodimus. — Quare qui nunc Infantes ante Baptismum morientes a vita excludunt, contra Scripturas, contra Dei Misericordiam, contra antiquam consuetudinem loquuntur.

And unto his Adversaries Argument from *John* 3. 5. He Answers, Quasi id Christus senserit, sine externo Baptismo nullum in Cœlos cuiquam aditum patere. — Sed qui locum unum cum alio comparant, aquæ nomine, nihil aliud nisi Spiritum Sanctum significari perspicient.

Unto another Popish Argument which is also our Authors, viz. That we are
borⁿ

born Children of wrath, and that there is no means provided against Original Sin besides Baptism. *Whitaker* Answers, *Nasci omnes ira filios fateor, sed quod nullo modo, nos eripi ex hoc misero statu, nisi per Baptismum, assumis, falsum esse affirmo. Num Spiritus S. non tantum in Sacramentis, sed etiam sine Sacramentis, sua nobis dona impenditur.* See also this whole Subject more fully handled against *Bellarmino* in *Whitakers posthumus Book De Sacram. Quest. 2. & de Baptismo Quest. 2.*

Dr. Fulke on the *Rhemists* Translation of the N. T. Answers our Authors chief Popish Argument from *Joh. 3. 5.* On this Text, The *Rhemists* say, — That no Man can enter into the Kingdom of God, nor into the fellowship of Holy Church without it [Baptism] whereby the *Pelagians* and *Calvinists* be condemned that promise Life Everlasting to young Children that Die without Baptism.

Fulke Answers, “It is not necessary in this place by Water to understand material Water, but rather the purifying Grace of Christ, as in *Cap. 4. v. 11.* whereof the washing with Water in Baptism is an outward Sign and Seal, which also is termed Fire *Mat. 3. 11.* The Water therefore in Baptism is not our Regeneration properly, but a Sacrament and Seal thereof. — Finally, when the word of Water in this Text, signifieth the purifying Grace of Christ, rather than the outward Element of Baptism, here can be no Argument drawn out of this place, that Sacraments confer Grace of the Work wrought, but according to the Dispensation of Gods Spirit, which worketh according to his own pleasure, as in this *Chap. v. 8.*

Andrew Willet also contradicts all our Authors Positions as Popish, *Synopsis Papismi Controvers. 11. Quest. 2. Pt. 1. P. 463.* “The Protestants say, The Sacraments have no power to give or confer Grace to the receiver: Neither are they immediate Instruments of our Justification: Instrumental means they are to encrease and confirm our Faith in the Promises of God; Of themselves they have no Operation, but as the Spirit of God worketh by them, our internal Senses being moved and quickned by those external Objects. — And the Sacraments have no other use or end than as they are helps for the Strengthening of our Faith; Grace of themselves they can give or confer none. *Ibid. Pt. 4. P. 473.* “The Protestants. Neither are the Sacraments necessary at all to any such purpose (being ordained for no such use) as to be means to apply the Grace of Justification unto us: But our Justification is only applied and apprehended by Faith. *Controvers. 12. Quest. 3. P. 483.* “The Papists, *Joh. 3. 5.* Unless a Man be born of Water, &c. Ergo it is necessary to Salvation to be Baptized.

Willet Answers, “First it is not necessary by Water here to understand material Water. — Water is here added as an Epithete of the Spirit, because it cleanseth and purgeth as Water. *P. 484.* Protestants. We acknowledge no greater necessity in Baptism, than in the other Sacrament, both which we grant to be necessary as helps and propes and profitable means to encrease our Faith: But not so simply necessary as that without them (there being no neglect nor contempt had of them) it were impossible to be saved. *Argum. 1.* The Children of the Faithful are Holy already even before they be Baptized, for they are within the Covenant and to them also belongeth the Promise.

Doctor *Morton* Dean of *Glocester*, in his *Catholick Appeal*, impugneth this Popish Necessity of Baptism with many Arguments. In *P. 250:* he saith, “A Fifth Argument may be derived from strange Paradoxes, (as we think,) which the presumed Necessity of Outward Baptism hath begot, as namely to equalize the Children of Faithful Parents with the Seed of Infidels, in respect of Grace and Damnation, to allow a Pagan to Baptize, &c. And at last recapitulates, and concludes his Discourse in these Words, “Our Adversaries defend, as an Article of Faith, that all Chil-

“ Children dying without Baptism are not saved: But are committed unto Prison,
 “ even in the Brim of Hell, there to endure the everlasting Punishment of Loss,
 “ which is the Privation of Blessedness. The Unsoundness of which Position is dis-
 “ cernible, first because, &c.

Unto these Divines of the Church of England, I shall add one more, whom no true Son of the Church will readily charge with gross Error in the plain Principles of Christianity, who notwithstanding advanceth the same Doctrine with the Scots Presbyterian Preachers concerning Baptism, and accounts the opposit Opinion to be Popish. I mean the Learned and Pious Doctor Usher Arch-Bishop of Armagh in his Body of Divinity, P. 365. “ But is Baptism of absolute Necessity to Salvation? Baptism — is not to be neglected, or slightly esteemed. Yet, where God denieth it, either “ in regard of the Shortness of the Infants Life, or by any other unavoidable Necessity, there comes no Danger from the want of the Sacraments, but only from the “ Contempt of them. Who are here to be confuted? First, The Papists, who have “ contrived — *Limbus Infantum*, &c. Secondly, Many ignorant People amongst “ us, who, for want of better Teaching, harbour in their Minds such Popish Con- “ ceits, especially, that Baptism doth confer Grace upon all by the Work done, “ (for they commonly look no higher,) and they conceive a kind of Inherent Ver- “ tue and Christendom (as they call it) necessarily infused into Children, by hav- “ ing the Water cast upon their Faces. Hence the Minister is oft posted for to Bap- “ tize in a private Chamber, to the Dishonour of that Ordinance. And which is more “ intollerable, in case of the want of a Minister, Women will undertake to be Bapti- “ zers, which is a Monstrous Profanation of so high a Service. — We must know, “ that Sacraments properly do not give us any Right unto God and his Christ, but “ only Seal up and Confirm that Right and Interest which already we have in Gods “ Covenant and Promise. — God promiseth Christ and his Benefits to the Faithful, “ and to their Seed, and then he gives us Baptism to Seal these Promises: It is not “ Baptism that saves us, but the Promises: It is not Water that purgeth our Sins, “ but the Blood of the Covenant. And, P. 369. Some have the Outward Sign, “ and not the Inward Grace; Some have the Inward Grace, and not the Outward “ Sign. We must not commit Idolatry, by Deifying the Outward Element.

Here we find the Reverend Bishop as plainly contradicting our Authors Opinion, as if he had had his Pamphlet in View.

I shall not need to cite any Scots Presbyterian Divines, for I think our Author will not much Question, that his Opinion in their Judgment is accounted Popish. What are the Sentiments of our present Episcopal Clergy in this Matter will be best known, when they publish a full Confession of their Faith. But I apprehend our Authors Opinion is not as yet universally received amongst them. For one of their Doctors, and lately a Professor of Divinity, taught plainly, that there is no infallible Connexion betwixt the Sacraments and Salvation, and that Men may be saved by Means of the Word without the Use of Sacraments: And this he confidently asserts to be a thing so well known, that it needs no Proof. He whom I point at is Author of a Dissertation called *Discurfus Academicus de Theologia Comparativa*: Wherefore let the Doctor speak for himself, P. 16. § 24. *In tertio ordine mediorum salutis, quæ neque absolute necessaria, neque certa & infallibilia sunt, numerantur Pastores, Societates Religiosæ seu Ecclesiæ, Sacramenta, Cultus Religiosus Publicus, Disciplina seu Politia Ecclesiastica; & si quæ alia à Deo instituta sunt, ut Homines ad Pietatis Officia in Sacris Literis plene & perspicue proposita, vel addiscenda, vel recolenda, vel præstanda excitantur. Hac cum Aeterna Hominum Salute, nullam certam & infallibilem Connexionem habere; notius est, quam ut ulla Probatione aut Illustratione indigeat. — Nam certum est, eos qui Scripturis potiuntur, modo eas diligenter legant, ac sedulo*

scrutentur, & viam Salutis ibi descriptam invenire, & inventam ingredi; & in ea constantiter progrediendo (favente Gratia Divina Aurà) Salutem consequi posse, etiam si in ejusmodi Mundi Plaga degant, ubi — neque Sacramentorum, quorum Participes fiant, ulla sit Cópia.

If any of our Episcopal Clergy shall value more the Judgment of *Arminians* in this Matter, than that of any of the *Orthodox* I have formerly mentioned, let them hear one for all, *Philip Limborg*, in his *Theolog. Christian. Lib. 5. Cap. 66.* where, after he hath confuted the *Popish* Opinion concerning the Efficacy of the Sacraments, and answered our Authors Arguments from *Tit. 3. 5. Joh. 3. 5. Act. 22. 16.* He accuses the *Contra-Remonstrants* of Obscurity in the manner of proposing their Opinion, but concludes his own in these Words, § 31. *Restat ergo ut dicamus, Deum Gratiám suam per Sacramenta nobis exhibere, non eam Actu per illa conferendo, sed per illa tanquam Signa clara ac evidentia eam representando & ob Oculos ponendo: — Estque hac Efficacia nulla alia quam Objectiva, qua requirit Facultatem Cognitivam rite dispositam, ut apprehendere possit illud, quod Signum Objective Menti offert.*

Ibid. Cap. 68. § 7. Quæres. Si ergo Baptismus sit præceptum, etiam hodie quemvis Christianum obligans, an ergo nemo Baptismo absque Salutis jacturâ carere potest? Resp. Præceptum Baptismi esse Præceptum externum & rituale: Susceptio itaque Baptismi non est proprie Actus Sanctitatis; sed externa Sanctitatis Professio. Non ergo Baptismus est recipiendus, quasi per se ad Salutem ducat, sed Reverentiâ Divini Præcepti. Fieri ergo posset, ut quis Baptismo careat absque ulla sua culpa, ac proinde absque Salutis sua jactura; veluti Infantes, & Fidelis inter Infideles versans, omni Baptismum recipiendi occasione destitutus. Non enim nuda Baptismi carentia, sed ejus Contemptus nos peccati reos facit. § 9. Qui Padobaptismi necessitatem urgent, in diversas abeunt partes, neque uno nituntur omnes fundamento. Pontificii & Lutherani urgent, Baptismum esse Lavacrum Regenerationis, & medium quo Deus Regenerationem Hominibus confert. — § 10. Baptismum non esse Lavacrum Regenerationis, satis ex eis, qua antea de Sacramentorum Efficacia disputavimus, constare potest. § 11. Quod vero speciatim Sententiam Pontificiorum attinet; Fidei Habitum Infantibus per Baptismum infundi, ineptum plane est, &c.

I shall not multiply Testimonies, so much hath been said, as may suffice to make good what I undertook to evince, that our Authors Positions and Proofs are the same with these of the *Papists*, and opposit to the common received Doctrine of the *Reformed*. And therefore it is no Falshood, or Calumny, if his Opinion shall be called *Popish*.

What I have designed for the Second Part of this Treatise may appear in due time. Mean while, his chief Charge being Answered in this First Part, I shall wait to know, if this Author shall make any Reply, or acquiesce in the Answers already given him.

F I N I S.



Errata Corrigenda.

Page 5. Line 34. for *withbut*, Read, *without*. P. 7. L. 7. for *with*, R. *without*. P. 24. L. 8. for *Zuinglist*, R. *Zuiglius*. Ibid. L. 11. for *novâ*, R. *novos*. Ibid. L. 43. for *Sess. R. Sess. 5.* P. 25. L. 13. for *Priviledgium*, R. *Privilegium*. Ibid. L. 39. for *Baptismari*, R. *Baptizari*. Ibid. L. 41. for *Walsangus*, R. *Wolfgangus*. P. 26. L. 48. for *se invalide*, R. *per se invalide*. P. 27. L. 5. for *falsum*, R. *falsam*. P. 29. L. 6. for *falsissimi*, R. *falsissime*. Ibid. L. 38. for *Saiden*, R. *Leiden*. Ibid. L. 42. for *obsignet*, R. *obsignent*. P. 30. L. 31. for *obsignandum*, R. *obsignandam*. P. 31. L. 10. for *Loc. Com. 2. R. Loc. Com. 12.* P. 32. L. 29. for *si*, R. *fre*. Ibid. L. 35. for *Salurienses*, R. *Salmurichenses*.